

DESK

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN
JUL 1
PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

modern

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

language

VOL. LXX, NO. 6, JUNE 1955

notes

- 393 A Note on the Demon Queen Eleanor. R. L. CHAPMAN
- 396 A Middle English "Rake's Progress" Poem. R. H. BOWERS
- 399 *Canterbury Tales* A 11. F. P. MAGOUN, JR.
- 400 The First Cambridge Production of *Miles Gloriosus*.
LEICESTER BRADNER
- 403 A Note on the Death of Lear. GERALD SMITH
- 404 A Comment on "A Book Was Writ of Late. . . ." J. M. FRENCH
- 405 Coleridge and the Greek Mysteries. RICHARD HAVEN
- 408 "Erasmus Perkins" and Shelley. LOUISE S. BOAS
- 413 Aminadab in Hawthorne's "The Birthmark." W. R. THOMPSON
- 415 A Further Note on *Conjointure*. D. W. ROBERTSON, JR.
- 416 An Episode in Molière's *Amphitryon* and Cartesian Epistemology.
R.-L. HÉBERT
- 422 Pascal, Callières, and the *Bon Mot*. SPIRE PITOU
- 424 An Italian Letter by Voltaire. J. G. FUCILLA
- 426 Sartre et Heidegger: deux sensibilités. ROBERT CHAMPIGNY
- 429 Lastanosa and the Brothers Argensola. K. L. SELIG
- 432 *The Dwarf*: A Note on Lagerkvist's Use of Human Deformity.
R. D. SPECTOR
- 433 Origin and Authorship of the Divan-Poem "Nimmer Will Ich
Dich Verlieren." KURT KEPPLER

REVIEWS

- 438 J. F. MADDEN and F. P. MAGOUN, JR., *A Grouped Frequency Word-List of Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (A. H. ORRICK)
- 438 A. K. MOORE, *The Secular Lyric in Middle English* (R. O. PAYNE)
- 443 DOROTHY EVERETT, *Some Reflections on Chaucer's "Art Poetical"* (R. O. PAYNE)
- 445 G. B. PARKS, *The English Traveler to Italy, The Middle Ages (to 1525)* (R. M. LUMIANSKY)
- 445 L. L. MARTZ, *The Poetry of Meditation* (H. N. FAIRCHILD)
- 448 J. M. PATRICK, ed., *SAMLA Studies in Milton* (RICHARD WOOD)
- 450 A. S. ROE, *Blake's Illustrations to the Divine Comedy* (EDWARD WILLIAMSON)
- 454 J. B. HUBBELL, *The South in American Literature, 1607-1900* (FLOYD STOVALL)
- 457 J. R. REAVER, *Emerson as Mythmaker* (S. E. WHICHER)
- 458 AASTA STENE, *Hiatus in English* (N. E. ELIASON)
- 459 PAUL IMBS, *Le Subjonctif en français moderne* (M. SANDMANN)
- 461 ANGEL DEL RIO and AMELIA A. DE DEL RIO, *Antología general de la literatura española* (B. W. WARDROPPER)
- 463 *Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie* (OTTO SPRINGER)

modern language notes

KEMP MALONE,
General Editor

DON CAMERON ALLEN

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

STEFÁN EINARSSON

ANNA HATCHER

WILLIAM H. McCLAIN

GEORGES POULET

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER

EARL R. WASSERMAN

S. K. HENINGER, JR.,
Secretary

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$6.00 in the United States; \$6.25 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md. Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress of 16 July 1894.

AXON

afolia

ologie

through

s; \$6.25

e, \$1.00

should

18, Md.

uscript

ices, The

. Every

d return

tors are

re, Md.

rate of

Congress

Section

pañola

ologie

through

\$6.25

2, \$1.00

18 M4

100

as The

Every

and return

LOUIS IX

10

re, M.

1988

1

A

de

da

H

SW

“

st

89

88

th

J

de

L

hi

de

ta.

no

W

25

VO

modern language notes

VOL. LXX, NO. 6, JUNE 1955

A Note on the Demon Queen Eleanor

In the thirteenth-century Middle English romance *Richard Coeur de Lion*,¹ the hero's mother is a beautiful stranger named Cassodorien, daughter to the King of Antioch. She asks that her marriage to Henry II "be done priuily," and the next morning at mass she swoons just before the elevation of the host. Her explanation is: "For j am þus jschent,/ I dar neuere see þe sacrement."² The stricken Henry does not take these signs amiss. After fifteen years he assents to the suggestion of an earl that Cassodorien be forced to see the sacrament. He is then astonished to see her fly out through the roof, carrying off their infant daughter and giving young Prince John a fall that breaks his arm. Richard's mother is, in short, a demon or fairy mistress of the widespread "Swan-Maiden" type.³

Supernatural parents, of course, are not rare in romance. Merlin, Lancelot, and Alexander are strangely-born. But it is rare that the historical parent of a recent historical monarch is represented as a demon. When *Richard Coeur de Lion* was written, Eleanor of Aquitaine had been dead a scant fifty years, and her memory had surely not perished.⁴ The English versifier could hardly have been ignorant

¹ *Der Mittlenglische Versroman über Richard Löwenherz*, ed. K. Brunner, Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, XLII (Wien, 1913), vv. 43-234.

² *Ibid.*, vv. 193-194.

³ See E. S. Hartland, *The Science of Fairy Tales* (New York, 1891), pp. 255-332, for a discussion of the "Swan-Maiden" stories.

⁴ Eleanor's memory is still very lively: M. V. Rosenberg, *Eleanor of Aqu-*

of Eleanor's fame, and he must have assumed that his readers would identify Cassodorien with Eleanor. Was he, nevertheless, simply attributing supernatural parentage to Richard in order to account for that crusader's prodigious exploits? It is more likely that he was relating, from his French source, a legend which had become attached to Eleanor during the years closely following her death in 1204, which may indeed have been associated with her during her lifetime.

Eleanor was the kind of person who would attract legend in any age. She had an uncanny ability to get and keep the upper hand, she had sway over powerful men, her management was firm and aggressive. Yet she was full of beauty and grace, the patroness of troubadours. The monk Richard of Devizes, her contemporary, described her in superlatives: "Queen Alienor—an incomparable woman, beautiful and modest, influential yet moderate, humble and learned (qualities which are rarely found in a woman) who was old enough to have had two kings for husbands, and two kings for sons, even now indefatigable in any labour, and whose endurance was the admiration of her age."⁵

It is not surprising that this "incomparable woman" accumulated a number of picturesque legends.⁶ Nor is it surprising that in spite of her virtues she was not universally admired, that her legend in fact is entirely derogatory. In the ballad *Queen Eleanor's Confession* she is an adultress. In the tale of Fair Rosamund Clifford she is the evil-doer, while the adultress Rosamund is a sweet unfortunate. Even Richard of Devizes, quite under her spell, was aware of certain putative royal indiscretions: "This very queen, in the time of her former husband, was at Jerusalem. Let no one speak more on that head: I know it well. Be silent."⁷

Walter Map, a member of Henry II's ambulant court, propagated another of the unsavory speculations about his Queen:

He [Stephen] was succeeded by Henry, the son of Mathilda, and to him Eleanor, the Queen of France, cast glances of unholy love. She was the wife

taine (Boston, 1937); C. H. Walker, *Eleanor of Aquitaine* (Chapel Hill, 1950); Amy Kelly, *Eleanor of Aquitaine* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).

⁵ Richard of Devizes, *Chronicle*, in *The Church Historians of England*, trans. J. Stevenson (London, 1858), Vol. v, pt. 1, p. 258.

⁶ See E. Berger, "Les aventures de la reine Aliénor. Histoire et légende," *Comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1906*, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (Paris, 1906), pp. 702-712; and F. M. Chambers, "Some Legends Concerning Eleanor of Aquitaine," *Speculum*, xvi (1941), pp. 459-468.

⁷ Richard of Devizes, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

of that most pious King Louis, but she managed to secure an unlawful divorce and married Henry, and this in spite of the charge secretly made against her that she had shared Louis's bed with Henry's father, Geoffrey.⁹

Map may have intended an insult to Eleanor when he told the story of Henno-with-the-Teeth.⁹ Henno finds by the Norman shore a lovely maiden, who says she has been sent to marry the King of France. Henno marries her instead, begets children, and loses her in much the same way as Henry loses Cassodorien: she flies out through the roof when she is discovered, in her bath, to assume the shape of a dragon. The names and places in the story are more than vaguely suggestive of contemporary matters, and it may be conjectured that here the demon-legend began.¹⁰

In any event, the legend was well established soon after Eleanor's death. Philippe Mouskès in his *chronique rimée* (ca. 1240) draws an unflattering picture of Eleanor, and signalizes her diabolism: "Et quant vint à son desfulbar,/ Si leur a dit: 'Voiies signar,/ Dont n'est mis cors prou délitables?/ Lou rés digat q'ère déables,/ Et q'eu ère riens à tos sens./ Malostruge et non cobinens.'" ¹¹ He then recites the facts of her birth: the Count of Aquitaine while hunting meets a beautiful lady near a fountain; he marries her; they have children, including Eleanor; after a space the Countess flies through the church roof in the familiar way.¹²

The "Minstrel of Rheims" in one of his *récits* (ca. 1260), after rehearsing Eleanor's legendary attempt to elope with Saladin, attributes to Louis VII's barons a belief in her diabolic nature: "'Par foi dient li baron, le mieudres consaus que nous vous sachiens donneir ce est que vous la laissez aleir, car c'est uns diables, et se vous tenez longuement nous doutons qu'elle ne vous face mourir et ensorceller, et ainsi vous n'aurez nul enfant de li.'" ¹³

The male side of Angevin house likewise attracted the legend of a demon ancestress. Giraldus Cambrensis tells the story of "a certain

⁹ Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, trans. F. Tupper and M. B. Ogle (London, 1924), p. 297.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 218-220.

¹¹ This would not be the only place where Map uses one of his stories as an exemplum. In a kind of *explicatio* added to the story of King Herla, he complains about Henry II's zeal for rapid and continuous movements. See *ibid.*, p. 18.

¹² Philippe Mouskès, *Chronique rimée*, ed. Reiffenberg (Bruxelles, 1838), II, 244-245 (vv. 18704-711).

¹³ *Ibid.*, II, 245-249 (vv. 18720-817).

¹⁴ *Récits d'un ménestrel de Reims au treizième siècle*, ed. Natalis de Wailly (Paris, 1876), p. 6.

countess of Anjou, of remarkable beauty, but of unknown nation, . . . who was in the habit of coming very seldom to church."¹⁴ Being restrained one day before the "celebration of the secret canon of the mass" she flies out through a lofty window of the church, and is never seen again. Caesar of Heisterbach observes that "even the kings now [ca. 1230] ruling in Britain, which we call England, are said to be descended from a phantom mother."¹⁵

It is impossible to know precisely how this floating bit of folklore became attached to Eleanor. Walter Map may have been responsible, or the legend of the demon countess of Anjou may have been transferred, quite naturally, to her redoubtable successor. It seems clear, in any event, that it was not invented by the English writer of *Richard Coeur de Lion*, nor by the French author of his "book." It had early been associated with Eleanor in the popular and literary mind. It was an accepted part of her thirteenth century reputation, and testifies in a striking way to her powerful hold on the imagination of her age.

Cornell University

ROBERT L. CHAPMAN

A Middle English "Rake's Progress" Poem

In 1908 when Eleanor P. Hammond published her comprehensive *Chaucer Manual*, she provided a much more detailed account of the contents of Harley MS. 7578 than was then available to students in the old Harleian catalogue of 1808. She correctly described as "exceedingly coarse in character" some then unedited ME anonymous verses preserved uniquely in apograph fair copy on fol. 16^r-16^v. The standard Brown & Robbins *Index of Middle English Verse*, No. 551, repeats her description. Perhaps for this reason these verses have never been printed. They are coarse (but no coarser than Chaucer's *Miller's Tale* or the *Aenigmata* recently published by Henry A. Person in his *Cambridge Middle English Lyrics*, pp. 53-54); however, they do evidence a saving sense of humor and pose some minor problems in ME lexicography. For these reasons they are printed below with

¹⁴ Giraldus Cambrensis, *On the Instruction of Princes*, in *The Church Historians of England*, trans. J. Stevenson (London, 1858), Vol. v, pt. 1, p. 224.

¹⁵ Caesarius of Heisterbach, *The Dialogue on Miracles*, trans. H. Scott and C. C. Bland (London, 1929), p. 139.

modern pointing and capitalization. My colleague and good friend,
Professor Thomas Pyles, has kindly read my typescript.

(fol. 16^r)

I

- 1 Burgeys, thou haste so blowen atte the cole
That alle thy rode is from thine face agoon;
And haste do so many dos shotte and ystoole,
That fleesh vpon thy carkeys is theyre noon—
5 There is nought lefte but empty skynne and bone.
Thou were a trewe swynkere atte the fulle,
But nowe thy chaumbre takes been echon
Peessed and ffeedde, and of her laboure dulle.

II

- Thy warderer that was wonte for to be
10 Mighty and sadde and grene in his laboure
So wery is of superfluite,
He wise no more be none ratoure.
Hym selfe he is thy verrey actuloure,
For so sayne they that knowe his impotence
15 As welles as ye, my maistre reveloure.
Nowe been ye apte to lye in contynence.

(fol. 16^v)

III

- Thy pilers of thyne body in apperence
Been sufficient to vtwarde juggment
But they been feynt and weike in existence,
20 For that her stuffe iwastede is and spente.
And yette pou haste a desirous talente
For to fullefill that þat wol not be.
For loue of God, be not impaciente
But what that I shalle say nowe, herken mi.

IV

- 25 Whanne thou lay atte the stronde haue remembrance
Oones howe þat ye tooke a maladie
Off whiche thou fescest so feruent greunaunce

1 blowen atte the cole. Here probably "engaged in venery," rather than
"to stir up trouble between two other persons," the usual meaning.

3 Construe: "And hast caused so many does (young girls) to be shot and
stolen."

7 takes, sb., "buttons," hence "testes." Not found in *OED* in this sense.

8 peessed and fled, vbl., "appeased and put to flight," hence "exhausted."

9 warderer, sb., "club," hence "the membrum virile." Not found in *OED*
in this sense.

12 Construe: "He vows no more to be a router" (i.e., lawless person).

13 actuloure, sb., "manager."

25 stronde., sb., "strand, shore": hence "when thou were sick unto ex-
tremity." With perhaps an allusion to The Strand in London.

27 fescent, vb., "face," hence "suffer."

- That verrely thou weneste for to dye
 And alle was for excesse of venerye.
 30 And that thy selfe be knewe vnto the route
 Of hem that weren in this compayne
 Of which my selfe was oon, but is none doute.

V

- And ther with God thou madest forwarde
 That if Him liste to helth the restore
 35 Thou woldeste neuere shethen afterwarde
 So vsely as thou didest byfore.
 And vnto vs thou crideste euermore,
 Frenedes, beeth ware of excesse & outeraige
 Namely of shote, for it smerteth so soore
 40 That it to man deth paieth for his wage.

VI

- Fulle ruly was thise face for to byholde
 And dedely was thy drery countenaunce
 And brethedeste vnto sighes, depe and colde
 So that it were a sorowe and a penaunce
 45 A man to haue alle the circumstaunce.
 Not kanne my witte remembre al thinges
 But this I woote wele, that thy recemblaunce
 Was like to oon of the thre dede kinges.

VII

- And euer syne the same similitude
 50 [Seirmoneth] hath with the, not wote I why.
 But if I shulde in archerie conclude
 As that a bonen somewhat tolde haue I,
 It is none nede forbeden hastely
 A man to venie whiche that may not stonde:
 55 Ne the for to dispenden largely
 For spare mote thy poore bagge sonde.

University of Florida

R. H. BOWERS

- 35 shethen, vb., "to sheath," hence "to copulate."
 39 shote, sb., "fornication," with the double entendre of venereal disease contracted from promiscuous philandering. Not found in *OED* in this sense.
 48 the thre dede kinges. I have no suggestion as to what piece of mortuary (?), perhaps in London, this may refer.
 50 MS Seionruth
 51 archerie, sb., "venery." The *Ludus Coventriae* (*EETS ES* No. 120, p. 128/136) uses *archere* in the evident sense of a seducer who "shett þe bolt." Not in *OED*.
 52 bonen, sb., "kindness" (?). Cf. *OFr bonaire*, sb. "courtesy."
 56 sonde, sb., for *shonde*, "disgrace, ignominy." Construe the line: "must spare thy poor scrotum further disgrace."

Canterbury Tales A 11

To capitalize or not to capitalize? In the conventional if engaging opening to the *Canterbury Tales* Chaucer, remarking on the signs of a pleasant English April and the attendant song-birds, writes:

so priketh hem nature in hire corages,

to be rendered "so nature incites them in their hearts (to mate)" or the like. However, the question arises: just what is intended by the word "*nature*"? Editors who do not capitalize (Skeat, Robinson, and quite likely many others) must understand the word in a general sense (*NED* "*nature*" 2) and here as virtually equivalent to the natural mating instincts of birds. Such a concept is, as remarked above, very general and almost a little flat.

The Globe editors, and most recently Charles W. Dunn (*A Chaucer Reader* [Harcourt, Brace: New York, 1952], and quite likely others), spell nature with a capital N (*Nature*). This is almost certainly right, for it is all but impossible here to think of anything but that personification (cp. *NED* "*nature*" 9), "goddess" if you will, *Natura*, who to the medieval mind presided over what we today might think of as the genetic factor or element in life. Fortuna took care of worldly vicissitudes.

That Chaucer's literary notions about *Natura* were quite concrete is apparent from *PF* 298 ff., especially 379-413, where the dreamer comes upon that spectacular queen, vicar of the Lord Almighty, whose interest in the sex-life of birds is unbounded.

Since Chaucer evidently thought of *Natura* as virtually the patron saint of birds, his editors might well consider here capitalizing the word *nature*, at the same time give a cross-reference (or vice versa) to *PF* 298 (see Skeat, I, 516, and Robinson 904, col. 1-2).

Harvard University

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

The First Cambridge Production of *Miles Gloriosus*

The restoration of Roman comedy to the Italian stage at the end of the 15th century had an important influence on the development of vernacular comedy. This must have been evident to the English humanists who visited Italy a little later and saw the comedies of Ariosto and Machiavelli. When they added Plautus and Terence to their new humanistic school curricula some of them must have cherished the hope that the study and presentation of these plays might encourage in England a similar development of native drama.

Given this sort of expectant atmosphere it is not surprising that the first university production of Plautus in England, put on at Cambridge about 1522, should have been long remembered by those involved in it and by those who saw it. It is to their excitement and to their fond memories in later life that we owe our scanty knowledge of this memorable event. John Leland, the future historian and Latin poet, was in the audience, luckily for us, and not long afterwards¹ he addressed an ecstatic poem to Stephen Gardiner containing the following lines:

To quoque fabulas poetae
Antiqui lepidas quidem et uenustas
Illas, conspicuo decore quodam
Felix actor et eloquens, uel usque
Ad miracula, nunc suis theatris
Pulchre restituis, nitesque facto.
Miles lumina gloriosus ille
Sic certe mea capta detinebat
Ut dum uixero semper actionem
Illam uel memori sinu recondam.
Partes praestitit Hancuinus amplex,
Achinus quoque tunc suae decorum
Personae exhibuit: sed unus ille
Fabrilegus erat puellus, instar
Multorum lepidus, uenustus, ardens,
Cuius gloria crescet undecunque.*

In another, undated, poem to Gardiner Leland states that he was the producer of a "learned" play, and it seems likely that it is the same play he is thinking of.

¹ Since he expresses a hope that Gardiner will become a bishop, the poem must be before 1531. It sounds as if written soon after the play was given.

* Hearne's reprint of Leland's *Encomia* (Oxford, 1715), p. 117.

Lucida cumque scholis monstres pigmenta politae
 Rhetorices, lambit prima corona comam,
 Et cum stet docto te fabula docta chorago
 Comica tum scenis parta corona tuis.²

Many years later he wrote a poem to Sir Thomas Wriothesly, then one of the chief secretaries to Henry VIII, in which he reviews the successes and triumphs of Wriothesly's career. Among these Leland gives prominent place to his brilliant acting as a youth in the *Miles gloriosus*.

Quid nunc commemorem, quo te comoedia Plauti
 Accepit plausu, miles et ille tumens?
 Si mihi iudicium solidum perfloruit unquam,
 Aures si aut oculi praevaluere mei,
 Dispeream si non fueris tam lucidus actor,
 Quam qui maxime, et hic dicere uera libet:
 Sic oculos, sic ille manus, sic ora gerebat,
 Sic quoque personuit, quisquis et ille fuit,
 Ut dici possit, Romani cura theatri,
 Atque operis pretium rettulit omne sui.⁴

Finally, in 1565, Gardiner himself in a letter to Sir William Paget recalls the play, now long past but still fresh in his mind, in the following words:

This is another matter than when I played Periplectomenus, you Meliphidippa, and my Lord Chancellor [Wriothesly] Palestrio, and yet our parts be in this tragedy that is now in hand. If we three should now sit together and take counsel what might be done, as we did in the comedy, we should not be a little troubled, and Palestrio fain to muse longer for compassing of this matter and seding of it, as the poet calls it, than we did there.³

Here we learn what part it was that Wriothesly had acted so well, and we also learn the parts taken by Gardiner and Paget. By comparison of these documents we can now say that *Fabrilegus* of Leland's first poem must be intended as a punning Latin version of Wriothesly (i. e., *faber*-wright and *legus*-ly, which is as close to the English as many of Leland's curious Latin proper names are). Leland's Achinus is probably Nicholas Hawkins, B. A. King's College, 1519, described in the *Dictionary of National Biography* as a

² Bodleian MS of Leland's Latin poems, Tanner, 464, iv, fol. 42r.

³ Hearne's reprint of Leland's *Encomia* (Oxford, 1715), p. 159.

⁴ *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, ed. by J. A. Muller (New York, 1933), p. 186. Muller, in his previous biography of Gardiner, was the first to call attention to this passage.

student of civil and canon law, and therefore undoubtedly a friend of Gardiner. Of Hancuinus, however, I can find no trace.

What was the exact date of this important event in the history of English drama? Leland's phrase *nunc suis theatris restituis* implies that it was the first performance of Plautus in England, but the reference in Hall's chronicle to a "goodly comedy of Plautus" at court in 1519, probably by John Rightwise's St. Paul's boys, shows that it was not. Let us see whether it was the first in Cambridge. In the first poem referred to in this article Leland describes Gardiner as *iuris utriusque consultissimus*. Since the latter received his degree in civil law in 1521 and in canon law in 1522, the use of such a phrase would hardly have been justified before 1522. In that same year Leland received his bachelor's degree and is supposed to have gone to Oxford, and later to Paris, whence he did not return to England until 1525. Turning to the actors in the play we find that Wriothesley as early as February 12, 1524 (modern style) referred to Cromwell as his master, which suggests that he had ceased to be a student at Cambridge. Hawkins also, having taken his B.A. in 1519, would probably have sought an outside post by this time. Gardiner himself was first employed by Wolsey in the autumn of 1524 and was increasingly occupied in the Cardinal's affairs from then on. All this makes it impossible to suppose that Leland saw the play after his return to England in 1525, and the logical time for him to have seen it would have been in 1522.

It happens that the earliest previously recorded performance of a Plautus play came just at this time. The dramatic records published by G. C. Moore Smith in his *College Plays produced in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1923) show that the *magnum giornale* of Queens College contains a reference to a *comoedia Plauti* (which one not specified) in 1522/23. Leland would hardly have made such a point of Gardiner's "restoring" Plautus to the stage if his production had followed soon after the Queens College production; and we have seen that if it did follow it must have followed closely. Gardiner's *Miles gloriosus* either was the Queens play, in spite of the fact that he was a Trinity Hall man, or it must have preceded it. In either case it was, so far as we know, the first acting of Plautine comedy in Cambridge. And so meager are our records that the next production of *Miles gloriosus* we know about was that given by the Westminster School in 1564.⁶

⁶ T. H. Vail Motter, *The School Drama in England* (London, 1929), p. 92.

If Gardiner and his friends did entertain any bright hopes for an influence of their revival upon contemporary English dramatists they were, for a long time at any rate, doomed to disappointment! The best that their generation could produce was the simple farce or even simpler debate of Heywood's interludes. It was a graduate of Oxford rather than Cambridge who was to compose what was probably the first full-length English comedy. Nicholas Udall wrote *Ralph Roister Doister* in 1553, according to the latest scholarly opinions, and in that same year we know that he was schoolmaster to Bishop Gardiner. What are we to make of this possibly fortuitous connection? Did Gardiner retain his interest in the drama all through life—it seems to have lasted until 1545 at any rate—and was it for this reason that he employed as his schoolmaster a man who already had a reputation for play-writing? Biographical documents give no answer to this question. But there is another point of interest here. While in the employ of a man who had once produced *Miles gloriosus* Udall wrote a play in which an English braggart is the principal object of satire. Are we to suspect subtle flattery on Udall's part or direct suggestions and advice from his patron? At any rate, one hopes that in the midst of all the troubles of the English Reformation the aging bishop attended the performance of his schoolmaster's play and for a few brief hours relived his youth.

Brown University

LEICESTER BRADNER

A Note on the Death of Lear

The *Problems of Aristotle*, a pseudo-scientific text of 1597, speaks of a death of joy as follows:

Why have some men died through griefe and sadness, and some through joy, and none for anger?

Is it because joy doth coole the very inwarde guts?

(Sig. H)

When Strotzo, one of the villains of Marston's *Antonio's Revenge*, explains Andrugio's murder to Maria, he pretends that Andrugio had died a natural death of joy on hearing Piero's declarations of love and reunion:

The vast delights of his large sudden joyes
 Opened his pores so wide, that's native heate
 So prodigally flow'd t' exterior parts,
 That thinner [the inner?] Citadell was left unmand,
 And so surpriz'd on sudden by colde death. (I. v. 10-14)

As A. C. Bradley has always "fantastically" maintained,¹ the deaths of Gloucester and Lear are from a combination of joy and grief on hearing that they will be joyfully reunited with their loved ones. Edgar says of his father:

. . . but his flaw'd heart,
 Alack, too weak the conflict to support!
 "Twixt two extremes of passion, joy and grief,
 Burst smilingly. (V. iii. 196-199)

Likewise, it is this "large sudden joy" as Lear thinks he sees Cordelia's lips move that proves too great a contrast to his grief.

University of Maryland

GERALD SMITH

A Comment on "A Book Was Writ of Late . . ."

Professor Schultz's argument (*MLN*, LXIX [1954], 495 ff.) that Milton was trying in his sonnet on *Tetrachordon* to say that Sir John Cheke and the age he lived in "hated learning" seems a strained interpretation. It seems more likely that Milton, saturated as he was by Latin style, merely transposed the "like ours" from the spot where a modern writer would naturally put it to one where its reference is somewhat ambiguous. He (or we) might probably have said in simpler prose, "Thy age hated not learning, like ours [i. e., as ours does], worse than toad or asp." In other words, "Your age did not hate learning as ours does."

This interpretation is borne out by a passage in *Tetrachordon* which states Milton's opinions about Cheke and his age with what seems like unmistakable clarity. He refers to the reign of Edward VI (1547-1553; Cheke's dates were 1514-1557) as "on record for the purest and sincerest that ever shon yet on the reformation of this

¹ *Shakespearean Tragedy* (London, 1949), pp. 290-291.

lland" (Columbia Milton, iv, 231). This quotation in itself seems to settle the point, since it was written only shortly before the sonnet and on the same subject. But Milton continues by praising Edward as "That worthy Prince" for "having utterly abolisht the Canon Law out of his Dominions," and commends the achievement of his committee of 32, appointed "to frame anew som Ecclesiastical Laws." Their work "with great diligence was finisht, and with as great approbation of that reforming age was receav'd." The new laws, he goes on, were "founded on the memorable wisdom and piety of that religious Parliament and Synod." Though unfortunately, he adds, they were never put into effect because of the untimely death of that "good King," this statement surely leaves no doubt that Milton thought highly of the learning and piety of the age of Sir John Cheke.

Rutgers University

J. MILTON FRENCH

Coleridge and the Greek Mysteries

Some years ago W. K. Pfeiler¹ pointed out certain parallels between Coleridge's discussion of the Cabiric deities in a fragmentary 1818 lecture² and Schelling's essay "Über die Gottheiten von Samothrake."³ Pfeiler concludes his article with the remark:

Perhaps it is also not without foundation to suggest that the mention of Paracelsus and Jacob Boehme by Coleridge in his concluding remarks was inspired by the mystical enthusiasm displayed by Schelling at the end of his lecture, in which he refers to the Cabeiri as links of those unbreakable magic chains so impressively symbolized by the indissoluble harmonic movements of the celestial bodies.

As a matter of fact, at about the time he was preparing his lecture, Coleridge was engaged in rereading Boehme's *Works* and several of his marginal notes⁴ contain additional information on this subject.

¹ "Coleridge and Schelling's Treatise on the Samothracean Deities," *MLN*, LII (1937), 162-164.

² *Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism*, ed. Raysor (London, 1936), pp. 191-4.

³ *Sammtliche Werke* (Stuttgart und Augsburg, 1861), VIII, 345-426.

⁴ Coleridge's four volume set of *The Works of Jacob Behmen*, ed. G. Ward and T. Langcake (London, 1764-1781), is now in the British Museum. I hope to publish the complete marginalia in the near future.

A note to Chapter I of *The Threefold Life* reads:

Doubtless, the first conceivable manifestation of Being, its first act as it were, must be in two forms only—viz. Attraction and [Repulsion, *crossed out*] contraction, and the Mother of both or the Identity in the difference, can only be conceived as an astringency, a hungering after Being, a ground or presupposition of Being rather than real Being. Hence the τὸ ὑπερούσιον of the Platonists—the Axieros and Axiokersa of the Cabiric and the Ceres (cheresh = hunger) of the Eleusinian mysteries.

"Cheresh" is apparently a phonetic spelling of the Hebrew חֶרֶשׁ and points undeniably to Schelling's essay. Schelling argues that the root meaning of the names of the gods of the mysteries was hunger or yearning, and tries to support this by tracing the etymologies of the various names, *Akieros*, *Ceres*, *Demeter*, etc., back through Phoenician and Hebrew roots.⁵ The name *Ceres* Schelling derives from חֶרֶשׁ, which he takes to involve the meaning "hunger": "Ceres namlich is das hebr. חֶרֶשׁ Kersa nur das chald. חֶרְשָׁא"⁶

Even more striking is a note on Chapter IX of *Signatura Rerum*:

Singular were it only as mere coincidence with the Camilus or Camillus of the Samothracean Cabiri, and the mercury or Hermes φιλόανθρωπος.

Superis Deorum
Gratus et imis
Horat.

It would seem that Coleridge must have written this note with Schelling's essay actually before him, for if we turn to Schelling's discussion of the Camillus, we find ourselves directed to a footnote in which this same quotation from Horace appears.⁷

But if this establishes beyond question Coleridge's familiarity with Schelling's work, it should also be noted that his discussion of the mysteries is not entirely derived from the German. Coleridge's interest in the mysteries goes back many years before the publication of Schelling's essay in 1815. According to Lamb, he was familiar with Iamblicus during his schooldays, and certainly he was in possession of the *De Mysteriis* both in the original Greek and in Ficino's Latin edition by 1796.⁸ During the same period, he was reading Michael Psellus' *De Daemonibus*,⁹ which appeared in the Gloss to the *Ancient*

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 351-352, 382 n. 47.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 384, n. 48.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 392, n. 70.

⁸ See *Letters*, ed. E. H. Coleridge (Oxford, 1912), I, 182, and John D. Rea, "Coleridge's Intimations of Immortality from Proclus," *MP*, xxvi (1928), 202.

⁹ J. L. Lowes, *The Road to Xanadu* (London, n. d.), pp. 334-335.

Mariner and which he cites both in the 1818 lecture and in another given the following year¹⁰ as authority for the division of the Cabiric deities into two "trinities" connected by a seventh intermediary spirit, an idea which he associated with Boehme's seven "nature spirits."¹¹ Later, he read and annotated *A Dissertation on the Mysteries of the Cabiri* by G. S. Faber.¹² He did not find Faber's thesis that the mysteries were "rites commemorative of the deluge" acceptable, but the work also contains much historical material. In addition to these, Coleridge must have been acquainted with the opinions in Cudworth's *True Intellectual System*, which he read while at Bristol; and Coburn notes that he was familiar with Bishop Warburton's *The Divine Legation of Moses*,¹³ which also contains a discussion of the mysteries from a point of view congenial to Coleridge. Both Cudworth's attempt to associate the Cabiric deities with the Christian trinity and Warburton's belief that the mysteries represented a step away from polytheism towards an understanding of the "true God" are closely related to Coleridge's analysis in such a passage as the following note from Chapter XXII of *The Aurora*:

The Epoptae of the Cabiric mysteries knew the θεῖον and the Trinity in their but not in it's Genesis [out of, crossed out] ἐκ τοῦ θεῖου—but still the copula or Unity was the Irrational, and the three persons three *different* Gods: Zeus, Dionysus and Pallas.

All in all, Coleridge's discussions of the mysteries would seem not simply to show another borrowing from Schelling, but rather to provide another example of the addition of material from Schelling to ideas which Coleridge had already at least partially developed for himself. In this case, it should also be noticed that Schelling has provided little that is new beyond his fanciful etymological arguments. Coleridge's arguments concerning the place of the mysteries in the development of Greek religion and their influence on later mystical doctrines could have been derived from works which he had studied many years before he read Schelling's essay. In this as in some other instances, material taken from Schelling seems to obscure rather than illuminate Coleridge's argument.

University of Massachusetts

RICHARD HAVEN

¹⁰ *Philosophical Lectures*, ed. Kathleen Coburn (London, 1949), pp. 320-323.

¹¹ According to Pfeiler, the division of the Cabiric deities into a higher and lower triad is found "by implication" in Schelling.

¹² J. L. Haney, *Bibliography of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (Philadelphia, 1903), p. 113, n. 109.

¹³ *Philosophical Lectures*, p. 400, n. 9.

"Erasmus Perkins" and Shelley

From March to September, 1815, there appeared in London a liberal journal edited by "Erasmus Perkins" giving to Shelley, then unknown, a disproportionate amount of attention and space. The *Theological Inquirer* offered itself to the public as an unbiased journal, open to all parties for free discussion of religion, metaphysics, and moral philosophy. Its tone was set by two quotations on the title page and by the preface. The quotations were from Jesus: "Why judge ye not yourselves that which is right," and from Paul: "Prove all things, hold fast by the best." The preface, pointing out the need for a free journal, emphasized reason and virtue, and asserted that "all our faculties are produced by Nature, and directed by Necessity."¹

The editor's agreement with views expressed by Shelley undoubtedly led to his choice of *A Refutation of Deism* for the opening article, and to his inclusion in the first issue of the beginning of an extended laudatory review of *Queen Mab*. *A Refutation of Deism* was published in two parts, March and April; *Queen Mab* in March, April, May, and July. *Queen Mab* was presented in a running summary with direct quotation of a third of the poem. The reviewer, "F," unable to control his enthusiasm, contributed in the August issue the lines on Necessity from *Queen Mab*, Canto VI, to be included in the section devoted to "Original Poetry." In the July issue there was a fervent "Ode to the Author of *Queen Mab*," by "F," whose own poems published in the *Theological Inquirer* have a strong Shelleyan tinge.² In May another contributor, "Eunomus Wilkins," quoted in his article on Giordano Bruno the opening lines of the seventh canto of *Queen Mab*: "I was an infant when my mother went/ To see an atheist burned," commenting, "The inimitable author of *Queen Mab* . . . must have been thinking of Giordano Bruno." In June "Mary

¹ *The Theological Inquirer or Polemical Magazine* (London, 1815). Seven numbers only were issued, March through September (not eight, as in White, or six, as in Dobell). As a bound volume it went into a second edition. Each issue except the last consisted of eighty pages: discussions, reviews, poetry, extracts from sceptical writers. Bertram Dobell called attention to this journal and its connection with Shelley in the *Athenaeum*, March 7, 1885, p. 313. See N. I. White, *The Unextinguished Hearth* (Durham, 1938), pp. 45 and 395.

² R. C. Fair, a minor versifier and journalist. His "Ode" was reprinted in the 1821 "American" edition of *Queen Mab*. See N. I. White, *Shelley* (New York, 1940), pp. 409 and 696-7. The misspelling of the name was my error.

Anne" began a series of letters to the editor, taking issue mockingly with *A Refutation of Deism*.³

Shelley's name was not mentioned; most of the contributors, like the editor, hid behind pseudonyms, or behind initials not always their own. Only those brave souls who courted martyrdom risked prosecution and jail sentence for "blasphemous libel" at a time when it was subversive to question the literal truth of the Bible.

Though the dangerous portions of *Queen Mab* were omitted, "Erasmus Perkins" was deliberately directing attention to a daringly radical poem, as yet unpublished. Newman Ivey White came to the conclusion that Shelley knew and connived with "Erasmus Perkins" and "F"; and that Shelley may have financed the journal.⁴ This last is unlikely; but it is certain that he was cognizant of the proposed journal as early as January 1815, that he was consulted by the editor, whom he disliked, that he looked over and corrected the material, and that he was not wholly pleased by the inclusion of *Queen Mab*.

"Erasmus Perkins" is the most elusive of pseudonymous writers and is not listed in any dictionary of pseudonyms. He contributed to a number of journals, published a number of pamphlets, and was active as a translator and editor. He issued a prospectus for *Collectanea Sceptica*, reprints of sceptical writers such as Hobbes, Hume, Gibbon, Giordano Bruno, Spinoza, Condorcet, Helvetius.⁵

References to and quotations from many of these writers abound in the supposed writings of the Rev. Robert Wedderburn, an uneducated elderly mulatto from Jamaica, tried and sentenced to jail in 1820 for "uttering blasphemy" at a chapel in London where, as a Unitarian, he preached. "Erasmus Perkins" edited and published for his benefit the account of his trial and his address to the court. *The Monthly Repository* reviewed the *Trial*

merely to expose its scandalous falsehood. Erasmus Perkins is a man of straw. "The Rev. Robert Wedderburn" is, by his own confession on his trial "a superannuated journeyman tailor," and is a profane scoffer, we

³ Probably Mary Anne Carlile, who later went to jail for selling sceptical books at the bookshop of her brother, Richard Carlile.

⁴ White, *Unextinguished Hearth*, p. 44.

⁵ The prospectus is in the copy of the *Theological Inquirer* in the British Museum. Public support seems to have been lacking; apparently only one volume, D'Alembert's *Hell Destroyed*, was actually published. A prospectus couched in similar language listing the same authors was issued in New York in April, 1827, and distributed with the current issue of the *Correspondent*, edited and published by George Houston.

believe we may say, an avowed and malignant atheist. His present editor, who probably penned his Defence, appears under much the same character. . . . The poor unhappy creature is evidently a tool in the hands of others who are wicked enough to wish to overthrow religion, but who have not the courage to come forward to avow their nefarious design.⁶

Robertson in his *History of Freethought in the Nineteenth Century* refers to Wedderburn's *Letter to the Jewish Chief Rabbi* and *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury* as showing

a happy vein of irony and not a little learning, despite his profession of apostolic ignorance, and at the trial the judge admitted his defence to be "exceedingly well drawn-up." The explanation appears to be that the Letters were written wholly or mainly, and the defence drawn up, by an able hand, that of the Rev. Erasmus Perkins, a cultured dissenting minister of large experience and liberal views . . . a priest of the school of Helvetius. The identification may be made by comparing a note on p. 8 of the *Letter to the Archbishop* with p. 22 of Perkins' *Hints*.⁷

Robertson failed to notice that one pamphlet, *A Crutch for the Lame in Faith*, was listed among the publications of both Robert Wedderburn and "Erasmus Perkins": on the title page of the *Theophilanthropist's Manual*, translated from the French and edited by "Erasmus Perkins," it is listed among his works; at the end of the *Manual* it is advertised among the works of Robert Wedderburn.⁸

A different pamphlet with a similarly ironic title points more directly to the authorship of "Erasmus Perkins": *High-Heel'd Shoes for Dwarfs in Holiness*, which is in the form of a letter from Wedderburn to "Erasmus Perkins." In this there is a long summary of *Queen Mab* which parallels the material in the *Theological Inquirer* of 1815, but quotes only two innocuous lines from the poem. This is introduced with that pretence of disparagement which enforced the point of the summary and at the same time protected the publisher from prosecution:

Another shocking instance of the unparalleled depravity of the times is the publication of QUEEN MAB, a poem, by Percy Bysshe [sic] Shelley. This young madman, before he was known to the world by his "Revolt of Islam," "Alastor," "Prometheus," and "Cenci," a tragedy, printed this poem; but finding no bookseller in London who would publish it, the copies were given away privately. It became very scarce, and eight or ten guineas were offered

⁶ *Monthly Repository*, xv (London, 1820), March, pp. 177-8.

⁷ J. M. Robertson, *History of Freethought in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1930), I, 61.

⁸ *Manual of the Theophilanthropists* (London, 1822).

for it in advertisements. A young desperado, who aspires to the crown of martyrdom, has had the temerity to publish this amalgam of infamy. Some officious friend has conveyed a copy of it to me, and being deceived by the title, I was seduced to read it through. Good heavens! who would conceive that a title adapted to a work of fancy and imagination, should thus be made the vehicle for the Bedlamite ravings of Atheism and Democracy. To say there was no talent displayed in it would be uncandid, for it contains the strongest indications of a real poetical genius.⁹

"Erasmus Perkins" further betrays his hand by a footnote: "Dr. Wedderburn goes a little too far here: I shall answer immediately, in an 'Apology for Atheism, on Christian Principles.'—E. P."¹⁰

In this artful advertising of Shelley's poems in 1821 "Erasmus Perkins" shows his continued interest in Shelley and a desire to increase his audience. He was probably telling the truth when he stated in the preface to the 1821 "American" edition of *Queen Mab* (now known to have been published in England by Benbow) that he "was in England in the spring of 1815 and received a copy of the poem from the author who was then in his twenty-second year."¹¹

It is probable that "Erasmus Perkins" was no longer living in 1826 when Richard Carlile, in a fit of spleen, divulged his true name in uncomplimentary fashion in his *Republican*. Carlile was a self-educated man who had dedicated his life to the fight for a free press, free speech, and religious freedom. He may well have resented the fact that "Erasmus Perkins" had not fallen afoul of the laws of blasphemy, hiding safely behind his pseudonym, his learning, and his status as a gentleman. Persecution and prosecution were selective; poor men like Carlile and D. I. Eaton (whom "Erasmus Perkins" claimed to have befriended at his trial in 1812) were constantly watched and constantly apprehended, spending long years in jail, while men of greater learning, greater wealth, and higher social position were often ignored. Infidelity expressed in philosophic language was not judged as severely as freethinking expressed within the comprehension of the common man; and humble publishers and

⁹ Rev. R. Wedderburn, V. D. M., *High-Heel'd Shoes for Dwarfs in Holiness* (London, n. d.), pp. 12-3. The pamphlet is dated at the top of the first page "6th April, 1821." There is no clue to the meaning of the initials V. D. M. I am indebted to Mrs. Adaline Glasheen for a photostat of this pamphlet, with which I have verified my quotations. Bertram Dobell called attention to this reference to Shelley in the *Athenaeum*, May 9, 1885, pp. 597-8.

¹⁰ *High-Heel'd Shoes*, p. 10.

¹¹ Percy Bysshe Shelley, *Queen Mab* (New York, 1821). This is the edition referred to in *High-Heel'd Shoes*. See White, *Shelley*, I, 62, and F. Buxton Forman, *The Vicissitudes of Queen Mab* (Privately Printed, London, 1887).

booksellers like Eaton and Carlile were regarded as more dangerous than gentlemen-authors.

Writing to Cobbett's *Political Register* in 1813 "Gulielmus" queried Shelley's immunity. Why, he said, had the author of *The Necessity of Atheism* escaped prosecution:

True, the author being a student at the University of Oxford, did not avow his name; but the printer whose name and address were regularly appended, might have been compelled to give up the author. . . . But why, I would ask, is it that such writers escape the punishment inflicted on another for a like offence? Is it, not on account of their having promulgated the same sentiments, but because they have conveyed these sentiments in a language more refined? ¹²

Whatever his reason, Carlile did reveal the identity of "Erasmus Perkins" in a reference to Cobbett and his "friend, editor and publisher, Houston . . . avowedly an infidel to Christianity." The columns of the *Political Register*, "offered as a medium . . . for the refutation of 'The Age of Reason,' contained "many infidel pieces . . . inserted under the name of Erasmus Perkins, one George Cannon, the acquaintance of Houston and Eaton, and a notoriously bad character." ¹³

To Cannon there are two references in the journal kept by Shelley and Mary, the first entry Mary's, the second Shelley's. On the twenty-ninth of January 1815 Mary wrote: "Cannon calls but we do not see him. Talk and look over Cannon's papers; he is a very foolish man." ¹⁴ On 7 February 1815 Shelley wrote: "Cannon the most miserable wretch alive. Καταριπτει ευδαιμονεστατον υννον. He stays the evening, vulgar brute; it is disgusting to hear such a beast speak of philosophy &c. Let refinement & benevolence convey these ideas." ¹⁵

The papers to which Mary refers must have been the material for the first issue (March) of the *Theological Inquirer*, at least all that directly concerned Shelley. Mary's comment on Cannon is ambiguous; it may refer to him personally, or to his venture into the publishing

¹² Cobbett's *Political Registrar*, xxiv, 4 September, 1813, pp. 300-1.

¹³ *Republican*, XIII (London, 1826), 604. Robertson in quoting this in his *History of Freethought*, I, 61, misprinted "Common." It is possible that Cannon emigrated to America with George Houston, in whose weekly journal, *The Correspondent* (New York), v, April 4, 1829, pp. 165-7, there was a letter on Quakers signed "E. P." This may, however, have been a reprint from some English journal. The *Correspondent*, III, February 9, 1828, in its report on the annual dinner commemorating Paine's birthday lists among the poets whose healths were drunk "Percy Blythe Shelly" [sic], p. 43.

¹⁴ *Mary Shelley's Journal*, ed. F. L. Jones (Norman, 1938), p. 36.

¹⁵ *Mary Shelley's Journal*, p. 64.

field with a radical journal, or to his inclusion of *Queen Mab* and the *Refutation* in that journal. Shelley's entry leaves little to the imagination; he disliked Cannon violently, though he recognized his intellectuality. The Greek is illuminating: overthrows happiest slumber.¹⁶ Here Shelley refers to the resurrection of *Queen Mab*. Its appearance through summary and quotation in the *Theological Inquirer* constituted its first publication. Of the two hundred and fifty copies printed in 1813, only seventy had been distributed.¹⁷ Dedicated to his wife, Harriet, it was part of the life he had put behind him. He had given a copy to Mary in 1814, but now in his new life with her he preferred it to slumber.

He did not forbid its publication. However much he disliked the editor, who hid his identity under the name of "Erasmus Perkins," he certainly connived with him.

Orleans, Massachusetts

LOUISE SCHUTZ BOAS

Aminadab in Hawthorne's "The Birthmark"

There have been many interpretations of Hawthorne's "The Birthmark," none of which has considered the source of the name *Aminadab*. One of the more recent and definitive exegeses is R. B. Heilman's detailed study, "Hawthorne's 'The Birthmark': Science and Religion," an article centered about the terminology and imagery of religion in the story as Hawthorne has applied them to science. Science, according to Heilman, has assumed the one-time prerogatives of religion, and Aylmer, the scientist-priest of the new cult, seems less priest than God.¹ It is at precisely this point of Heilman's interpretation that *Aminadab*, Aylmer's laboratory underworker, assumes a significance which Heilman does not accord him.

Aminadab, a variant of *Amminadab*, receives mention ten times in the Bible. The gist of these references is that he was a high priest and the head of a family, a Levite, of that tribe which could

¹⁶ Edward Dowden, *Shelley* (London, 1886), I, 479, misinterprets here. Dowden assumed that Cannon had roused Shelley from deep slumber.

¹⁷ White, *Unextinguished Hearth*, p. 45.

¹⁸ "Hawthorne's 'The Birthmark': Science and Religion," *AQ*, XLVIII (1949), 575-583.

own no real property and to which was entrusted the priesthood of the Hebrew people. Upon Aminadab and his fellows was devolved the administration of the rites peculiar to Yahweh, the tribal deity of a primitive and nomad people. If it is agreed that Hawthorne had the historical Aminadab in mind, then Aminadab becomes a most important symbol in the story, one in perfect consonance with the religious imagery collated by Heilman. Aminadab becomes more than just a foil for Aylmer, more than just "the earthy, gross side of man's nature" as remarked by Brooks and Warren.² On the vehicular level he is the unimaginative assistant and subordinate of the intellectual Aylmer; on a more complex level he typifies religion subverted to the ends of science.

Aminadab is a symbol of an early authority which is now discredited; the priestcraft for which he stands is no longer significant. Men are no longer a primitive priest-ridden people, and indeed the priest himself has been relegated to a subordinate and contemptuously regarded role. From his sacrificial fire Aminadab no longer raises his grimly ecstatic face to the equally grimly ecstatic face of his anthropomorphic Yahweh. He stoops and drudges, a priest without votaries, his face "grimed with the vapors of the furnace,"³ and answers to the beck and call of the imperious *new* man as personified by Aylmer. Aylmer's star is in the ascendant, Aminadab's in decline.

The tension underlying the external relations of Aylmer and Aminadab remains for the most part hidden. Aylmer is perhaps too serenely confident of himself and scornful of his servant to be aware of it, and Aminadab is in no position to assault the bastion of science which Aylmer represents. And this from the standpoint of sheer artistry is as it should be; the conflict between science and authoritarian religion is not the motif of the tale even though it does reflect what we know to have been Hawthorne's apprehensions concerning the budding brave new world of the nineteenth century.

If we acknowledge the ramifications, as sketched above, implicit in Hawthorne's choice of the name *Aminadab*, then Aminadab's muttered comment "'If she were my wife, I'd never part with that birthmark'"⁴ assumes a deeper significance than has heretofore been accorded it. It is not the remark, as most commentators aver, of a gross

² Cleanth Brooks, Jr. and Robert Penn Warren, *Understanding Fiction* (New York, 1943), p. 105.

³ Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Complete Works*, ed. George P. Lathrop (Boston, 1882-83), II, 55.

⁴ Hawthorne, II, 55.

man easily satisfied and content with that which is less than perfect; it is a remark rooted in compassion. The old authoritarian religion, in spite of its excesses, had a greater respect for the human personality than has amoral science. Such an interpretation of the comment seems not inconsistent with the author's ambivalent attitude towards his Puritan heritage, nor does Aminadab viewed in this new light detract from the recognized theme of the story. On the other hand, it adds somewhat to the texture of a richly complex tale.

Texas Technological College

W. R. THOMPSON

A Further Note on *Conjointure*

Recently (*MLN*, LXIX [1954], 180-181) Professor W. A. Nitze reaffirmed his view that the word *conjointure* in Chrétien's *Erec*, v. 14, reflects the *iunctura* of Horace, *Ars poetica*, 240 ff. This view may indeed be correct, but it is possible that the verses in Horace, like those in Philippe Mouskés' description of grammar, may refer to the arrangement of words rather than to the ordering of plot elements.¹ Thus a modern French translation of Horace by F. Richard interprets the relevant lines as follows:

Je prendrais dans la langue courante les éléments dont je façonnerais celle de mes vers: si bien que tout le monde croirait pouvoir en faire autant, mais verrait à l'expérience que les efforts pour y réussir n'aboutissent pas toujours: tant a d'importance le choix et l'arrangement des termes, tant peuvent prendre d'éclat des expressions empruntées au vocabulaire ordinaire!²

The interpretation underlying this translation, which has been, perhaps, most forcefully stated by Professor Rostagni,³ is supported by the use of *iunctura* in vv. 46-48: "in verbis etiam tenuis cautusque serendis / dixeris egregie notum si callida verbum / reddiderit

¹ My phrase "elements of composition" in "Some Medieval Literary Terminology," *SP*, XLVIII (1951), 670, n. 7, was followed by a reference to Quintilian, who said (*Inst.* 9. 4. 22): "In omni porro compositione tria sunt genera necessaria: ordo, iunctura, numerus." Ir. 9. 4. 32 he explains, "Iunctura sequitur. Est in verbis, incisio, membris, periodis."

² "Classiques Garnier" (Paris, 1950), II, 277.

³ *Ars poetica* (Turin, 1930), pp. 69-70. Cf. A. S. Wilkins, *The Ars Poetica of Horace* (London, 1939), pp. 382, 383.

iunctura novum." There are, however, those who support the view assumed by Professor Nitze that in 240 ff. Horace was referring to subject matter and not to language.⁴ There is, it seems to me, no way of knowing with certainty how Chrétien would have regarded the passage.

The word *conjectura* in Alanus probably rests ultimately on a concept like that expressed by Hugh of St. Victor, *Didas.*, l. 9 (ed. Buttimer, p. 16), in accordance with which any artificial (as distinguished from divine or natural) creation is either "digregata coniungere" or "coniuncta segregare." Elsewhere (3. 4, p. 54) Hugh refers specifically to works of poets: "vel etiam diversa simul compilantes, quasi de multis coloribus et formis, unam picturam facere." The idea here seems to me quite similar to that of Alanus who said that poets compose "ut ex diversorum competenti conjectura, ipsius narrationis elegantior pictura resultet." Both writers may owe something to Horace's "ut pictura poesis," and it is possible that they may have been influenced by "series iuncturaque." Professor Nitze's judgment in this matter certainly deserves respect. But the relationship between Chrétien's *conjointure* and Alanus' *conjectura* seems to me clearer than that between either of them and Horace's *iunctura*.

Princeton University

D. W. ROBERTSON, JR.

An Episode in Molière's *Amphitryon* and Cartesian Epistemology

Critics quite agree with Grimarest that "Molière n'était pas seulement bon Acteur et excellent Auteur, il avait toujours soin de cultiver la Philosophie."¹ Not so unanimous, however, do they reveal themselves in accepting his rather gratuitous interpretation of Molière's

⁴ With the translation quoted above compare that of Léon Hermann, "Collection Latomus," VII (Brussels, 1951), p. 29.

¹ Grimarest, *Vie de M. de Molière* (Paris, 1877), p. 1. See also G. Lafenestre, *Molière* (Paris, n. d.), p. 144, and Sieur de Vizé, who writes: "Finissons donc ce point en disant que le défunt n'était pas seulement un habile poète, mais encor un grand philosophe" (*Oraison funèbre de Molière*, p. 31). Quoted by Moland is the following statement of La Grange and Vinot: "S'il fut fort bon humaniste, il devint encore plus grand philosophe" (*Vie de J.-B. P. Molière*, p. 26).

own philosophical system: "Chapelle et lui [Molière] ne se passaient rien sur cet article-là: celui-là pour Gassendi; celui-ci pour Descartes."² The traditional view is admittedly quite opposed to Grimarest's. It rather consecrates the well-nigh universal acceptance of the opinion that considers the philosopher of Digne as Molière's teacher of philosophy.³ Whether or not Molière received formal instruction in philosophy from Gassendi, nothing precludes the possibility of the latter's influence upon the thought of the author of *Amphitryon*. In fact, the collected works of Gassendi were published in 1658 when Molière was returning to Paris from the provinces.⁴ He could easily, and in all probability did, familiarize himself with the philosophy *à la mode*. That he embraced it as readily as some critics and philosophers would have us believe is not so firmly established an historical fact. Lafenestre perhaps best expresses Molière's attitude towards the systems of philosophy of his times when he declares:

Il [Molière] eût bien ri, sans doute, s'il avait pu prévoir qu'on voudrait, quelque jour, l'enrégimenter dans l'une ou l'autre des sectes philosophiques dont il raillait les subtilités impuissantes.⁵

Gustave Michaut is even more categorical when he considers Molière's ethics as a system reminiscent of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*:

On y [la morale de Molière] reconnaît sans peine la doctrine du juste-milieu, la morale qu'Aristote avait fondée dans sa *Morale à Nicomaque*, celle qu'on enseignait dans l'Université et dans les collèges. Et il n'y a là-dedans aucun gassendisme.⁶

Could it be that Molière received his philosophical instruction only at the collège de Clermont and not at Lullier's Parisian hôtel?

² Quoted by Lafenestre, p. 144.

³ Yet this opinion found its origin in the same *Vie* by Grimarest: "M. de Gassendi, ayant remarqué dans Molière toute la docilité et toute la pénétration nécessaires pour prendre les connaissances de la Philosophie, se fit un plaisir de la lui enseigner en même temps qu'à messieurs de Chapelle et Bernier" (*op. cit.*, p. 8). This view remained unchallenged until Brunetière declared in 1890: "A la vérité, quoiqu'en dise la tradition, on ne saurait prouver que Molière ait jamais entendu ni beaucoup connu Gassendi" (*Etudes critiques*, p. 196). Still more emphatically, in 1892, he stated: "Quelque mal en effet que l'on se soit donné jusqu'ici pour établir la réalité, on n'a pu prouver seulement que Molière eût jamais vu de ses yeux Gassendi, bien loin d'en avoir reçu des leçons de philosophie!" (*Les Epoque du Théâtre français*, p. 77). It was in 1922 that Gustave Michaut clearly established the fictional value of Grimarest's authority in his *La Jeunesse de Molière* (Paris, 1922), pp. 57-95.

⁴ Michaut, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

⁵ Lafenestre, *op. cit.*, pp. 146-147.

⁶ Michaut, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

Difficult as it is to determine the nature of the contact between Gassendi and Molière—if such ever existed—their spiritual affinity is discernible in Molière's attitude towards Cartesianism. Due attention has been given to Molière's criticism of Descartes's physics in *Les Femmes savantes*, for example, but it is surprising that the critics have somewhat overlooked what appears to be a subtle criticism of Descartes's epistemology in an instance to be found in Molière's *Amphitryon*.

The years 1664-1669 are characterized by Lafenestre as the "période la plus combative"⁷ of Molière's life. This period is marked by the very significant *Tartuffe* affair. Between *Le Sicilien* (February 1667) and *Amphitryon* (January 1668) Molière did not produce a single play.⁸ In his retirement at Auteuil he reread Plautus.⁹ No doubt he again read Rotrou's *Les Sosies* also, as *Amphitryon* eventually revealed.¹⁰ Did Molière include among his readings Gassendi and Descartes? This question begs for an answer. The originality of *Amphitryon*, however, amply demonstrates that Molière was not content to give a mere translation of Plautus or a slavish rendition of Rotrou. Despois and Mesnard underscore this important feature of the play:

L'Amphitryon fut comme une rentrée de l'auteur, qui avait fait relâche, une brillante rentrée. Cette comédie ne semblait pourtant promettre qu'une sorte de traduction; mais combien, dans le fait, elle montra d'originalité. Jamais, chez nous, le théâtre comique des anciens n'a eu une si heureuse résurrection, sous une forme toute nouvelle.¹¹

It is the purpose of this paper to show the originality of Molière's treatment of a dramatic episode already exploited by Plautus and Rotrou.¹²

Discussing the question of subjectivism in the appreciation of Molière's works, Michaut affirms:

Il ne s'agit pas de savoir s'il existe des rapports entre l'oeuvre de Molière et sa *biographie psychologique*: l'histoire de sa pensée. Il est évident qu'ils existent.¹³

⁷ Lafenestre, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

⁸ Cf. *Oeuvres de Molière*, ed. Despois and Mesnard (Paris, 1922), vi, 311—hereafter cited as D. M.

⁹ R. Benjamin, *Molière* (Paris, 1936), p. 177.

¹⁰ D. M., pp. 330-336.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 311-312.

¹² Brunetière's characterization: "*Amphitryon* n'est manifestement qu'une fable" (*Etudes critiques sur l'histoire de la littérature française*, p. 107) as well as Benjamin's: "*Amphitryon* est un jeu de poète cultivé" (*op. cit.*, p. 173), it is difficult for one to agree with.

¹³ Michaut, *Pascal, Molière, Musset* (Paris, 1942), p. 143.

An illustration of such a *rapport* may be found in the second scene of the first act of *Amphitryon* in which the Sosie-Mercure dialogue seems to reflect the Cartesian endeavor to prove one's existence by the intuition of the self. The Cartesian doubt is first reflected in this dialogue when Mercure attempts at convincing Sosie that he, Mercure, is really Sosie:

Mercure

Qui te donne, dis-moi, cette témérité
De prendre le nom de Sosie?

Sosie

Moi, je ne le prends point, je l'ai toujours porté.

Mercure

O le mensonge horrible! et l'impudence extrême!
Tu m'oses soutenir que Sosie est ton nom.

Sosie

Fort bien; je le soutiens, par la grande raison
Qu'ainsi l'a fait des dieux la puissance suprême,
Et qu'il n'est pas en moi de pouvoir dire non,
Et d'être un autre que moi-même . . .

A volley of blows discharged by Mercure ensues until the latter inquires:

Hé bien! es-tu Sosie à présent? Qu'en dis-tu?

Sosie

Tes coups n'ont point en moi fait de métamorphose;
Et tout le changement que je trouve à la chose,
C'est d'être Sosie battu.

When Mercure resorts again to violence, Sosie must admit:

Il est vrai, jusqu'ici j'ai cru la chose claire;
Mais ton bâton, sur cette affaire,
M'a fait voir que je m'abusais.

They agree to a truce. Sosie is allowed to speak freely:

Qui te jette, dis-moi, dans cette fantaisie?
Que te reviendra-t-il de m'enlever mon nom?
Et peux-tu faire enfin, quand tu serais démon,
Que je ne sois pas moi? Que je ne sois pas Sosie?

Until now Mercure's menaces and blows are of no avail; Sosie insists that it is he who is Sosie:

. . . Je ne puis m'anéantir pour toi,
Et souffrir un discours si loin de l'apparence.
Etre ce que je suis est-il en ta puissance,
Et puis-je cesser d'être moi?

S'avisa-t-on jamais d'une chose pareille?
 Et peut-on démentir cent indices pressants?
 Revé-je? Est-ce que je sommeille?
 Ai-je l'esprit troublé par des transports puissants?
 Ne sens-je pas bien que je veille?
 Ne suis-je pas dans mon bon sens?

When Mercure reveals the cache of the diamonds, Sosie is forced to admit:

Il ne ment pas d'un mot à chaque repartie,
 Et de moi je commence à douter tout de bon.
 Près de moi, par la force, il est déjà Sosie;
 Il pourrait bien encor l'être par la raison.

However, he hesitates:

Pourtant, quand je me tâte et que je me rappelle,
 Il me semble que je suis moi.

He seeks a criterion that will permit him to discover the truth:

Où puis-je rencontrer quelque clarté fidèle,
 Pour démêler ce que je vois?

The revelation of Sosie's cowardice is the supreme argument: Sosie is utterly vanquished:

Je ne saurais nier aux preuves qu'on m'expose,
 Que tu ne sois Sosie, et j'y donne ma voix.

To a 1668 audience this dialogue conveyed a message very different from that of a Plautus or of a Rotrou. The *milieu* in which the two earlier plays were written and performed—even *Les Sosies* which was performed in 1636 and published in 1638—had not been influenced by the type of speculation elaborated by Descartes. Between 1636 and 1668 the struggle between Gassendist sensualism and Cartesian spiritualism had contributed much to the revival of philosophical speculation in general. Only a few years after the *Discours de la méthode* (1637) appeared the *Méditations* (in Latin, 1641; in French, 1647), to which Gassendi appended his fifth objections. As already indicated, the works of Gassendi were published in 1658. The intellectual atmosphere had become very different. Words, as a result, had taken new meanings. It is in the light of these great changes that the above dialogue takes on a new significance.

The first five verses may be associated with the thought expressed by Descartes in the second meditation:

Mais je ne connais pas encore assez clairement quel je suis, moi qui suis certain que je suis; de sorte que désormais il faut que je prenne soigneusement garde de ne prendre pas imprudemment quelque autre chose pour moi, et ainsi de ne me point méprendre dans cette connaissance que je soutiens être plus certaine et plus évidente que toutes celles que j'ai eues auparavant.¹⁴

Descartes's mind, like Mercure's, brings forth objections: it calls for proofs, clear and certain. Like Descartes struggling to escape from complete scepticism, Sosie appeals to "la puissance suprême des dieux." Descartes had already written:

... je connais par ma propre expérience qu'il y a en moi une certaine faculté de juger, ou de discerner le vrai d'avec le faux, laquelle sans doute j'ai reçue de Dieu, aussi bien que tout le reste des choses qui sont en moi et que je possède; et puisqu'il est impossible qu'il veuille me tromper, il est certain aussi qu'il ne me l'a pas donnée telle que je puisse jamais faillir lorsque j'en userai comme il faut.¹⁵

Molière mocks at the notion of clarity: *la chose claire*. It is on this evidence that Descartes had established his criterion:

Et ayant remarqué qu'il n'y a rien du tout en ceci, *je pense, donc je suis*, qui m'assure que je dis la vérité, sinon que je vois très clairement que, pour penser, il faut être: je jugeai que je pouvais prendre pour règle générale que les choses que nous concevons fort clairement et fort distinctement sont toutes vraies.¹⁶

Yet, however evident the intuitive act may be in its result, there is always the possibility of being deceived by some *démon*: a designation given to Mercure by Sosie. Descartes had considered this possibility:

Je supposerai donc, non pas que Dieu, qui est très bon et qui est la souveraine source de vérité, mais qu'un certain mauvais génie, non moins rusé et trompeur que puissant, a employé toute son industrie à me tromper.¹⁷

Eager to convince Mercure of his identity, Sosie appeals to the senses: "cent indices pressants." Descartes had not neglected to accept the more obvious testimony of the senses:

Mais peut-être qu'encore que les sens nous trompent quelquefois touchant des choses fort peu sensibles et fort éloignées, il s'en rencontre néanmoins beau-

¹⁴ *Oeuvres choisies de Descartes*, ed. Garnier (Paris, 1865), p. 81—hereafter cited as *O. C.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

¹⁶ *Discours de la méthode*, ed. Etienne Gilson (Paris, 1925), p. 33.

¹⁷ *O. C.*, p. 78.

coup d'autres desquelles on ne peut pas raisonnablement douter, quoique nous les connaissions par leur moyen.¹⁸

To doubt such testimonies would suppose a state of dream or of madness. To the preceding considerations Descartes added:

Et comment est-ce que je pourrais nier que ces mains et ce corps soient à moi, si ce n'est peut-être que je me compare à certains insensés de qui le cerveau est tellement troublé et offusqué par les noires vapeurs de la bile, qu'ils assurent constamment qu'ils sont des rois, lorsqu'ils sont très pauvres.¹⁹

and

Toutefois j'ai ici à considérer que je suis homme, et par conséquent que j'ai coutume de dormir et de me représenter en mes songes les mêmes choses, ou quelquefois de moins vraisemblables que ces insensés lorsqu'ils veillent.²⁰

More logical than Descartes, Molière realizes the impossibility of erecting a sound philosophy of criticism on an intuitive act or process, if the starting point of the latter is total negation: his Sosie seeks in vain a "clarté fidèle." He must abdicate his own identity.

Seen in the perspective of the times, these similarities between Descartes's metaphysical inquiry and Molière's *Amphitryon* are not a mere coincidence, but, in my opinion, a rather comic use by Molière of Descartes's abuse of speculation.

University of Colorado

RODOLPHE-LOUIS HÉBERT

Pascal, Callières, and the *Bon Mot*

The present commentary on Pascal's sole allusion to the *bon mot*, "Diseurs de bons mots, mauvais caractère," affords reference to certain *loci classici*,¹ but no aid beyond this is furnished for reading the *pensée* more closely. Still, the abundance of seventeenth century allusions to the *bon mot*,² and especially the sentiment of the usually

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

¹ Cf. *Œuvres de Blaise Pascal*, ed. Brunschvicg (Paris: Hachette, 1921), XII, 52, note 3.

² Cf. "An Aspect of Classicism: François de Callières and the 'bon mot,'" *MLR*, XLVIII (1953), 185-8.

affable La Fontaine,³ would point to the possibility that this *pensée* is not merely a fruit of Pascal's solitary genius or, perhaps, a variation on a current literary theme.

In reference to this *pensée*, therefore, it would seem pertinent to call attention to some verse devoted to a description of the *diseurs de bon mots*. The vehemence of these alexandrians would confirm not simply that devotees of conversational glibness were everywhere,⁴ but also that they displayed such lack of discretion and taste in the use of their alleged wit that the *bon mot* may be regarded in retrospect as a symptom and, simultaneously, as a condition of malevolence, if not of malignancy, within the contemporary social structure. Also, it is significant that these verses should come from the pen of François de Callières: he was not only an arbiter of conversational manners at this time but also prominent in a group that had no particular sympathy for Port-Royal.⁵ In his *Des mots à la mode et des nouvelles façons de parler* (1692), he indicts the *diseurs de bons mots* for persistent practice of "les grossières équivoques, les fades Tur-lupinades, les quolibets, les façons de parler sales, and les injures indécentes" (181-2), and includes in his *Discours*, an intercalated poem, the specific categories of these "âmes communes":

Peu dignes de jouir de leurs hautes fortunes,
De jeunes indiscrets, menteurs & médisans.
De jeunes étourdis, mocquers & suffisans,
De jeunes débauchez [*sic*] de plus d'une manière,
Des brutaux insolens qui rompent en visière,
Des esprits inquiets, envieux, malfaisans,
Diseurs de Quolibets and d'Equivoques sales,
Dignes productions de leurs doctes cabales (189).

Now it seems that if Callières' description of the *diseur de bons mots* be the light in which to read Pascal's "Diseur de bons mots, mauvais caractère," it becomes apparent that the *pensée* is not a fitful fragment in the "brouillons immortels," but, on the contrary, another

³ *Œuvres de J. de la Fontaine*, ed. Regnier (Paris: Hachette, 1883 sq.), II, 248:

Dieu ne créa que pour les sots
Les méchants diseurs de bons mots.

⁴ Cf. Jean Bernier in the *Avertissement* to his *Réflexions, pensées, et bon mots* (1696): "Les mots, les pensées, les Réflexions, où on a cru voir quelque chose de vif et de surprenant, sont tellement venus à la mode depuis quelque tems, que les livres qui les promettent par leurs titres, n'ont guère manqué d'avoir quelque cours. . . ." Cf. also the *Préface* to the *Fureteriana* (1696).

⁵ Cf. Dom Michel Jungo, *Le vocabulaire de Pascal étudié dans les fragments pour une Apologie* (Paris: D'Artrey, n. d.), 147.

forceful and terse demonstration of man's deficiency as Pascal observed it. And it becomes clear why La Bruyère did not feel that he might be gilding a previous lily when he wrote, in *De la cour*:

Diseurs de bons mots, mauvais caractère: Je le dirois, s'il n'avoit été dit. Ceux qui nuisent à la réputation ou à la fortune des autres, plutôt que de perdre un bon mot, méritent une peine infamante: cela n'a pas été dit, et je l'ose dire.*

Marquette University

SPIRE PITOU

An Italian Letter by Voltaire

In the Biblioteca Comunale Queriniana of Brescia there is a letter written by Voltaire to the Abate Antonio Sambuca expressive of his sorrow upon receiving from him the announcement of the decease of a cardinal friend. This letter is not to be found in the Voltaire-correspondence volumes published by Moland, nor has it, as far as I can ascertain, appeared among any of the unedited letters printed subsequently. A reproduction of the letter follows:

[verso] All (*sic*) Signore; mio Signore e padrone colendissimo il Signore
abbate Antonio Sambuca

a Brescia

[recto] Signor mio e padrone colendissimo

Prangins sull'lago (*sic*) di
Ginevra

febraio 19

le porgo le più vive grazie dell'honore che m'ha fatto di scrivermi, e della consolazione che ne ò ricevuta. la sua singolare umanità verso di me, è ancora un nuovo argomento della benignità colla quale mi favoriva il defunto cardinale. mi condoglio di vivo cuore con lei della perdita di quel degno cardinale l'ornamento della chiesa e delle buone lettere, ma tutto si distrugge così.

moiono le città moiono i regni
copre la prosa e i versi arena ed erba,

chiunque à vissuto sessanta anni, e (*sic*) molto in debito alla natura. alcuni anni di più sono un gran favore il quale le auguro. mi lusingo che ella gode

* *Œuvres de La Bruyère*, ed. G. Servois (Paris: 1865), I, 330; and ed. A. Chassang (Paris: Garnier, 1876), I, 270.

doppo (sic) la morte del Suo caro padrone della testificazione della sua benevolenza e che la di lei amarezza viene un poco addolcita con una sorte degna del merito di V S ill.ma. Intanto partecipo di tutti i suoi sentimenti e me rassegnò con ogni maggiore ossequio

di V S Ill.ma

umil.mo devot.mo serv.re
Voltaire gentiluomo della
camera del re christianissimo¹

The addressee, Antonio Sambuca, was a prolific writer who has been all but forgotten except locally as a historian of his native community of Salò. He functioned as secretary under the famous Cardinal Angelo Maria Querini, author, director of the Vatican Library, founder of the Brescia library bearing his name, and Cardinal Giovanni Molino, serving under the former for twenty-eight years.² It was on January 6, 1755, that Cardinal Querini died at Brescia at the age of sixty-five. As Voltaire apparently used the château de Prangins residence for a very brief period, December 14, 1754-February 28, 1755, there can be no doubt that the obituary notice sent by Sambuca refers to Querini. The date of the writing of the letter is, therefore, February 19, 1755.

Voltaire obviously had cause to be greatly concerned since he had lost a sincere friend and admirer. For some years previously, 1745-1751, he had exchanged some letters with him³ and had done him the honor of dedicating his play, *Sémiramis*, to him. One of Voltaire's *Epîtres* addressed to Querini half-jestingly ends with the lines

C'est à vous d'instruire et de plaire;
et la grâce de Jésus Christ
chez vous brille en plus d'un écrit
avec les trois Grâces d'Homère.⁴

On his part, the Cardinal had translated into Latin and Italian fragments of his *Poème à Fontenoy* and his *Henriade*.⁵

¹ Thanks are due to Dr. Ugo Baroncelli, director of the Queriniana for his assistance in locating this letter. On Voltaire's knowledge of Italian, see Chapter I, "Voltaire et la Langue Italienne," in Eugène Bouvy. *Voltaire et l'Italie* (Paris, 1898). Many of the great Frenchman's letters in Italian are listed or discussed in Felice Tribolati's "Dall'Epistolario Italiano del Voltaire, Accademico della Crusca," *Nuova Antologia*, xxxvi (1877), 832-56.

² Information on Sambuca can be found in V. Peroni, *Bibliografia Bresciana* (Brescia, 1823), III, 187-90, and G. Brunati, *Dizionario degli Uomini Illustri della Riviera di Salò* (Milano, 1837), pp. 123-24.

³ The letters written by Voltaire to Cardinal Querini are mainly in Vol. IV, *Correspondance*, of the Moland edition.

⁴ See *Oeuvres Complètes*, ed. Moland (Paris, 1877), x, 358.

⁵ The most extensive discussion we have on the relations between Voltaire

In the verses cited in our letter Voltaire seems to be giving vent to his skepticism regarding the prevailing conception about literary writings, the immortality of which, in contrast to the transiency of the physical handiwork of man, had been proclaimed by Horace in his "Exegi monumentum . . ." (Ode XXX, Book III). Indeed, he may have had Horace in mind when he tampered with the verses that he drew without acknowledgment from Canto XV, stanza 20, of Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*, where in connection with the evocation of the ruins of Carthage the poet writes:⁶

Giace l'alta Cartago; a pena i segni
de l'alte sue ruine il lido serba.
Muoiono le città, muoiono i regni;
copre i fati e le pompe arena ed herba;
e l'uomo d'esser mortal par che si sdegni;
oh nostra mente cupida e superba!

Northwestern University

JOSEPH G. FUCILLA

Sartre et Heidegger: deux sensibilités

Esquisser une comparaison entre deux philosophes du point de vue de la sensibilité n'est peut-être pas oiseux lorsque ces deux philosophes sont, ou ont été, des philosophes de l'existence.

Heidegger se tourne vers la campagne plutôt que vers la ville. Le laboureur est évoqué à la fin de la *Lettre sur l'humanisme*. Assez maladroitement d'ailleurs: *L'homo faber* ne nous entraîne pas assez loin. Il faut passer au-delà de la conception du monde comme complexe d'ustensiles. Heidegger est un campagnard, mais un campagnard aristocratique. Les images de contemplation et de marche lui conviennent mieux que les images de travail myope, comme elles convenaient mieux déjà à Wordsworth. L'homme est le berger de l'Être:

and Cardinal Querini is Henry Charles, *Voltaire et le Cardinal Quirini* (Paris, 1887).

⁶ On Voltaire and Tasso, C. B. Beall, *La Fortune du Tasse en France* (Eugene, Oregon, 1942), p. 135, writes: "Voltaire a souvent parlé du Tasse dans ces ouvrages et les jugements qu'il a portés sur lui sont restés constants à toutes les époques de sa vie." The chapter from which this quotation is drawn, "Voltaire et le Tasse," pp. 134-59, represents the most reliable treatment of this subject. However, no mention is made of the two verses in the letter.

le berger tel qu'il est idéalisé dans quelque art hiératique. Autre image: celle de la route, celle du chemin des bois, non de la rue urbaine. De même la maison sera exaltée, la maison que les poètes inventent sous le nom de maison natale. Il s'agit d'une maison campagnarde, ouverte aux quatre éléments, perchée s'il se peut sur quelque colline. Il ne s'agit pas d'un appartement parisien.

Sartre est un citadin. La solitude même est sociale, lit-on dans *Saint Genet*. La société, comme la scène de théâtre, forme un huis-clos. La nature n'offre pas un refuge. Si l'on en croit certaines phrases de *Saint Genet* ou même de *L'Homme et les choses*, les choses ne nous révèlent pas un moi qui serait spécifique par rapport au moi social.

Pourtant, Sartre, sans doute plus que Heidegger, part d'une expérience de la chose. Mais justement, il part de la chose, ou des choses, non de la Nature avec une majuscule. Comme Heidegger, Sartre écarte l'instance instrumentale de la chose; mais avec un résultat bien différent.

Heidegger a beau installer l'angoisse au cœur de l'existence humaine, il n'en reste pas moins qu'en aristocrate, il ne semble guère tourmenté par le sentiment de l'injustifié. Le hiératisme perce dans son style oraculaire, qui s'oppose au style hargneux de Sartre. Ce hiératisme, que Heidegger a conservé de son enfance catholique, indique une certaine confiance, sinon bourgeoise, du moins aristocratique, ou cléricale, dans le rôle sacré de l'homme. L'homme est le favori, sinon de Dieu, vocable insuffisant, mais de l'Être. Par delà le christianisme, Heidegger, à la suite de maint penseur allemand, aime à faire miroiter devant ses propres yeux le miracle, à moins que ce ne soit le mirage, grec. Son héros serait sans doute ici Héraclite l'obscur, chantre du *logos*.

Tournons-nous vers Sartre. Si *L'Être et le néant* a choqué tant de bons esprits, c'est sans doute parce que l'Être, notion sacro-sainte des philosophes, ressort très déprécié de l'essai. L'être est attiré vers l'opacité de la chose, vers sa gratuité, vers sa stupidité. Aristocrate campagnard, Heidegger fait planer son regard au-delà des instruments, de la routine, au-delà de "ce-qui-est" pour pressentir à l'horizon, à un tournant de route, disait Alain-Fournier, L'Être lui-même. Petit bourgeois citadin, Sartre évite sans doute d'être pris par cette instrumentalité qui enchaîne l'ouvrier, mais il ne saurait pour cela devenir lyrique à propos du paysage. Le paysage, ce sont

les affiches, les murs, des rideaux sales, des caniveaux, des rues, des chairs humaines et autres. Ici l'oisiveté n'encourage pas le lyrisme, mais le dégoût. La signification humaine partie, le sens poétique ne surgit pas, mais bien la gratuité obscène de la chose urbaine.

Si donc Sartre et Heidegger rencontrent tous deux l'angoisse face au néant et à la liberté, leur réaction est fort différente face à ce qui est. Heidegger est le plus traditionnel. Son ouverture à l'être est originellement l'étonnement du philosophe grec, étonnement respectueux. L'idéal de perfection chez Platon est lié à la plénitude d'être. Mais pour Sartre, il n'y a pas plénitude, il y a trop plein. Tout apparaît, originellement, de trop, injustifié. Cette réaction fort originale par rapport à la tradition philosophique est la réaction d'une sensibilité.

Heidegger s'apparente aux romantiques primitifs, lesquels étaient relativement optimistes au niveau cosmique. Heidegger chérit Hölderlin. L'air, le ciel, la lumière exaltent le poète, s'ils le désespèrent aussi. Sartre se tourne vers les romantiques pessimistes. Il va aux poètes urbains: Baudelaire, Genet, et surtout Mallarmé. Le livre que Sartre prépare sur Mallarmé devrait montrer que le lien entre les deux auteurs est aussi profond que celui qui unit Heidegger et Hölderlin.

L'azur n'exalte plus Mallarmé; il ne fait que le désespérer. Aussi le poète s'en détourne-t-il. La nature a eu lieu, on n'y ajoutera rien, note le petit bourgeois Mallarmé. Et cette nature est avare de tableaux. Nous sommes loin de l'étonnement respectueux qui est traditionnellement de rigueur. Les remarques de Mallarmé sur le rêve et sur le néant préparent *L'Imaginaire* et *L'Etre et le néant*. Dans ce dernier essai, l'être se voit réduit au solide dans lequel la liberté liquide risque de s'engluer: on pense ici à Laforgue, à ses descriptions d'un aquarium qui est déjà un huis-clos. Heidegger a vu en Hölderlin le poète des poètes. On pourrait en dire autant de Mallarmé: aussi fournit-il un enseignement direct à Sartre.

Cet enseignement sera sans doute la nécessité de ne pas se contenter d'une morale poétique. Sartre laissera l'hypnotisme de la nausée pour se tourner vers une morale sociale. Le mage Heidegger, lui, ne considère la cité humaine qu'à l'intérieur d'un cosmos, de la maison de l'Etre. Il va vers une métaphysique, ou une supra-métaphysique, poétique.

Indiana University

ROBERT CHAMPIGNY

Lastanosa and the Brothers Argensola

On another occasion (*MLN*, LXVII [1952], 47-50), we studied an unusual and interesting relationship between numismatics and poetry by showing how Lastanosa illustrated and annotated his *Museo de las medallas desconocidas españolas* (Huesca, 1645) with citations of poems by Góngora. The Aragonese Maecenas also availed himself of the poetical work of the brothers Argensola to elucidate some special characteristic or the origin of coins from his collection.¹

After paying tribute to the eminent French collector Francisco Filhol,² Lastanosa states:

... assi nuestro trabajo merece alguna alabanza entre los Curiosos, pues les ofrecemos tan venerables, i gloriosas Memorias, que acreditan el Valor, Ingenio, i Prudencia de la Nacion Española: i destos Symbolos, i Trofeos, se entenderá, que el tributo que dieron los Romanos a sus Moradores llamandolos Barbaros, no fue por ser ellos gente montaraz, i ruda, sino por desviarse de sus inclinaciones, i ceremonias, como tambien los Griegos llamaron barbaros a los que no seguian sus ficciones (*prefación*, pp. 13-14).

To explain the term "barbaro" and to certify his point of view, Lastanosa refers to the following poem by Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola (*Museo*, p. 14):

Grecia llamava bárbara a la gente
que sus sciencias i ritos no bevia,
de que fingió en Parnaso tener fuente.

Roma, quando usurpó la monarquía,
i, junto con las sciencias, a su erario
el thesoro del mundo concurría,

al inculto español, su tributario,
también le llamó bárbaro, i agora
es nombre de ignorantes ordinario.³

¹ Prof. Otis H. Green (*The Life and Works of Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola* [Philadelphia, 1927], p. 52) refers to Lupercio's interest in numismatics.

² The French bibliophile was eulogized by Gracián in *Agudeza* . . . and in *El Discreto* (*Obras completas*, ed. E. Correa Calderón [Madrid, 1944], pp. 288, 336), and his splendid library was described by Andrés de Uztarroz, *Diseño de la insigne i copiosa biblioteca* . . . (Huesca, 1644). Consult Ricardo del Arco y Garay, *La erudición española en el siglo XVII y el cronista de Aragón Andrés de Uztarroz* (Madrid, 1950), II, 829, 981-999; Gallardo, *Ensayo* . . . I, 198, no. 193; A. Coster, "Antiquaires d'autrefois: à propos de quelques lettres inédites de François Filhol, hebdomadier de Saint-Etienne de Toulouse, au chroniqueur d'Aragon Don Francisco Ximénez de Urrea," *Revue des Pyrénées*, XXIII (1911), 436-471.

³ *Rimas*, I, 136. Except as noted, all quotations from the poetry of the brothers Argensola follow the text of Prof. Blecua's edition: *Rimas de Lupercio*

Apparently several locations had been suggested for the provenience of Medalla III. Lastanosa believes that the coin is from Andújar, formerly Iliturgi, and again cites as his authority Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola:

Tú, famosa Iliturgi (cuya gloria,
destas varias mudanzas ofendida,
con dudas anduviste en la memoria),
en Andújar quedaste convertida,
de tus antiguos títulos privada,
en que agora te ves restituida.
No fueron éstos, no, negar la entrada
al romano feroz con mano fuerte,
por guardar a Cartago la fe dada;
ni de Publio Cornelio defenderte
tan obstinadamente, que primero
pudo venter a España que venterte;
que el blasón más illustre i verdadero
fué por pastor a Eufrasio haver tenido,
del gran patrón de España compañero;
que haviendo el mundo con su fe venzido,
su cuerpo te dexó por prenda cara,
i tú le diste el tûmulo devido.⁴

The *Museo* also contains as an appendix a *Discurso . . . de las medallas desconocidas españolas del Doctor Iuan Francisco Andrés*. To show that a coin is of Spanish origin on account of the hairdo of the portrait, the author refers to Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola who "escribiendo una espinela contra el uso de traer guedejas grandes los hombres, cantò assi" (p. 147):

La antigua verdad, por ruda
o por libre de artificio,
la mostró un pinzel propicio
en sus retratos greñuda.
También lo está por aguda
la ficción de nuestra edad.
¡O preciosa antigüedad!
¡Quien será el que no se irrite
de que a la fraude acredite
la greña de la verdad?⁵

y Bartolomé L. de Argensola (Zaragoza, 1950-51). Concerning the polemic over the term "bárbaro," consult also Arco y Garay, *op. cit.*, I, 443-446.

⁴ *Museo*, p. 63; *Rimas*, I, 156-157.

⁵ *Rimas*, II, 164.

For Lastanosa, patron of the arts and antiquarian, and Andrés de Uztarroz, primarily a chronicler, a collection of poems could serve as a commonplace book or as a sort of encyclopedia. Thus in reference to the city of Calatayud, it is stated: "Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola engrandece a Calataiud, por el temple de las aguas de los rios que la fertilizan, i bañan; i por la abundancia de las frutas, en este elegantissimo Epigrama" (*Museo*, pp. 157-158):

Terreno, en cuyos sacros manantiales
suele Marte bañar Yelmos, i Arneses,
i de las Picas las ferradas mieses,
para bolver Diamantes sus metales.

No sin emulacion Pomona, i Pales
te libran de influencias descorteses;
ossas dar frutos en agenos meses,
i el ocio no conoce tus umbrales.

Mas ni tu Genio prospero te alaba,
ni la que armaste juventud robusta
como el Hijo de Fronto, i Flacila.

El te dà nombre BILBILIS de AVGVSTA
quando a su docta urbanidad afila
festivas flechas, con que armò su aljava.*

Again to explain the name of the place Julia Celsa, today called Belilla, renowned for its bell, the author cites (pp. 171-172) a poem of Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola:

Sacro metal en Julia Celsa suena,
émulo de proféticos alientos,
que nos previene a insignes movimientos
con propio impulso i sin industria agena.⁷

The Johns Hopkins University

KARL LUDWIG SELIG

* *Rimas*, II, 421. Here, however, we follow the text as given in the *Museo* in view of some decided variants with the reading accepted by Prof. Blecua. It is of interest to note that the *Museo* is not listed or mentioned by R. Foulché-Delbosc ("Pour une édition des Argensola," *Revue Hispanique*, XLVIII [1920], 317-496), nor by Prof. Blecua in his chapter on "Manuscritos e impresos utilizados," *Rimas* I, lx-xciii. Góngora scholars have likewise disregarded Lastanosa's treatise; see Miguel Artigas, *Don Luis de Góngora y Argote, biografía y estudio crítico* (Madrid, 1925); Juan Millé y Giménez and Isabel Millé y Giménez, "Bibliografía gongorina," *Revue Hispanique*, LXXXI-2 (1933), 130-176; Hewson A. Ryan, "Una bibliografía gongorina del siglo XVII," *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, XXXIII (1953), 427-467.

⁷ *Rimas*, II, 185.

The Dwarf: A Note on Lagerkvist's Use of Human Deformity

Pär Lagerkvist repeatedly uses deformed figures as symbols in his work. Although the characters are often unlike, the author employs them overall as a basis for judging normal human behavior. At first there may seem little resemblance between Lindgren, with his withered legs, in "The Basement" (*The Eternal Smile* [New York, 1954]) and the incarnation of evil in the main character of *The Dwarf* (New York, 1945), Lagerkvist's Renaissance novel. However, in the adjustment that Lindgren makes to his world, we get a caustic commentary on that world; and despite the dwarf's twisted views and lack of perception, it is through his eyes that we perceive the distorted morality of the Renaissance period.

Not to recognize the use that Lagerkvist makes of the dwarf's deformity leads to a failure to appreciate the Swiftian morality of the author. Physical deformity, for Lagerkvist, is an externalization of human frailties of character. Thus at the very outset of *The Dwarf*, in that character's appraisal of the "Great Master" Bernardo, he concludes, "In what way is he misshapen, I wonder?" (p. 32)—and the *he* may very well be emphasized.

Human behavior and the human body frequently nauseate this little Gulliver-like character who describes himself and his tribe: "We belong to that race and at the same time we stand outside it" (p. 98) immediately after a depiction of an orgy that drives him into "the hay between the cook and the horrible groom who stinks of horses" (pp. 96-7) in a scene reminiscent of the fourth book of Gulliver.

The most savage attack on humankind is the detailed account of the war, with its pages of lust and ravaging. If one imagines that this is the twisted judgment of the dwarf, one should recall Lagerkvist's sardonic story of "The Venerated Bones" (*The Eternal Smile*), and its satirical assault on man's attitude towards war.

But specifically, the figure of the dwarf must be seen as the concretized image of man's evil. In one passage after his imprisonment he tells us:

It is true that I mixed the poison, but on whose orders? It is true that I was the death of Don Riccardo, but who was it wished his death? It is true that I scourged the Princess, but who begged and prayed me to do so? (p. 216).

And finally he informs us that he is certain the prince will soon set him free because, "If I know anything of my lord, he cannot spare his dwarf for long" (p. 228). Certainly this is a commentary on man's inherently evil nature.

Long Island University

ROBERT DONALD SPECTOR

Origin and Authorship of the Divan-Poem "Nimmer Will Ich Dich Verlieren"

Suleika's response "Nimmer will ich dich verlieren" to Hatem's "Locken haltet mich gefangen" is considered to be one of the most beautiful poems of the *West-Eastern Divan*, and it has even been proclaimed to be the key not only to the true understanding of the Book Suleika¹ but also to the real appreciation of Goethe's relationship to Marianne von Willemer.²

For a long time these verses of Suleika have been attributed to Marianne von Willemer by many writers, among them Konrad Burdach.³ In 1914, however, Julius Wahle referred to a Goethe-manuscript in the University Library of Bonn among the posthumous papers of Sulpiz Boisserée, containing drafts in Goethe's own handwriting of the Divan-poems "Bedenklich" (in the "Book of Love"), "Locken haltet mich gefangen," and of lines 2-4 of "Nimmer will ich dich verlieren." The fact that these three lines existed in a draft in Goethe's handwriting, according to Wahle, justified the conclusion that the whole poem was the work of Goethe and not of Marianne.⁴ Wahle's discovery and argumentation at first also convinced Burdach,

¹ Cf. Trunz, Hamburg edition of Goethe's works, Vol. iv, p. 568.

² F. Gundolf, *Goethe* (1916), p. 643. W. Milch, *Bettina und Marianne* (1947), pp. 57 ff.

³ See his notes in the *Sophienausgabe* (Weimar edition) of Goethe's works, I, 6, 169, and in the *Cottasche Jubiläumsausgabe*, Vol. v, p. 393; further in *Schriften der Goethesellschaft*, xxvi (1911), Introduction, p. 36, where he expressed the view that these lines were written by Marianne before her farewell from Goethe in Heidelberg on September 25, 1815.

⁴ See Wahle's description of the Bonn manuscript and comments in the Weimar edition I, 54, 563, 564. Wahle, who had only a photograph of the Bonn manuscript at his disposal, apparently did not notice lines 5-8 written in pencil on the back.

who in 1919 expressly referred to Goethe as the author of the poem,⁶ but later apparently became doubtful again.⁶

In spite of these objections made by Wahle and, temporarily at least also by Burdach, the great majority of the writers continued to attribute the authorship of the poem to Marianne. Among the more recent ones we mention W. Milch,⁷ K. Buchheim,⁸ H. Pyritz,⁹ and H. A. Korff.¹⁰ To Karl Bahn, the author of *Marianne von Willemer; Goethes Suleika* (1928), our poem even served as the basis for a phantastic story: Marianne's alleged verses, according to Bahn, were an indication that Marianne, after her farewell from Goethe in Heidelberg, planned a divorce in order to be able to devote her life exclusively to Goethe.

The assertion that Marianne was the author of the poem was apparently first made by Th. Creizenach in the introduction to his edition of Goethe's correspondence with Marianne.¹¹ According to Creizenach, Marianne had informed the painter Moritz von Schwind to this effect. This assertion, Creizenach continued, agreed very well with Goethe's own words in the *Noten und Abhandlungen zum besseren Verständnis des West-östlichen Divans*: "Sie, die Geistreiche, weiß den Geist zu schätzen, der die Jugend früh zeitigt und das Alter verjüngt"¹² None of the earlier writers knew of any such contention as was made by Creizenach, among them Düntzer,¹³ v. Löper,¹⁴ and Simrock,¹⁵ although Düntzer, carefully investigating Marianne's contributions to the Book *Suleika* commented: "Man könnte dieses Gedicht Marianne zuschreiben wollen"—without, however, drawing any such conclusion.

⁶ "Zum hundert-jährigen Gedächtnis des Westöstlichen Divans," *Jahrbuch der Goethegesellschaft*, IV (1919), reprinted in *Vorspiel*, II, 444.

⁷ Burdach in Vol. V of the *Welt-Goethe-Ausgabe* (Mainzer Ausgabe) stated on p. 400 that Wahle had made it probable that Goethe was the author of the poem. However, p. 410 contains the note: "Von Marianne von Willemer?" with reference to the poem under discussion. Burdach apparently still considered it possible that Marianne wrote the first draft of the poem before she left Heidelberg (see note 3), which was then copied or adapted by Goethe.

⁸ *Op. cit.* in note 2.

⁹ *Suleika: Das Göttliche im Menschen* (1948), pp. 20 ff.

¹⁰ *Goethe und Marianne von Willemer; eine biographische Studie* (3rd ed., 1948), p. 49.

¹¹ *Der Geist der Goethezeit*, IV (1953), 491. In *Die Liebesgedichte des West-östlichen Divans in zeitlicher Folge* (2nd ed., 1949), Korff designated Marianne's authorship as doubtful.

¹² 1st ed. (1877), p. 56.

¹³ *Cottasche Jub. Ausg.*, V, 240-1.

¹⁴ "Goethe und Marianne von Willemer," in *Westermanns Monatshefte*, XXVIII (1870), 639 ff., 651.

¹⁵ *Goethes West-östlicher Divan* (Hempel, 1873), p. 183.

¹⁶ *Goethes West-östlicher Divan* (1875).

Moritz von Schwind came to Frankfurt in May 1833 as a professor at the Frankfurt Art Institute.¹⁶ During his stay in Frankfurt he became acquainted with Marianne and took part in a number of her musical evenings.¹⁷ It is most unlikely, however, that Marianne made at this time to Schwind any such claim as that asserted by Creizenach, for according to H. Grimm's trustworthy testimony, Marianne's contribution to the *West-Eastern Divan* was kept a closely guarded secret until 1856 when she first told Grimm of it.¹⁸ Schwind never returned to Frankfurt during Marianne's lifetime, and Schwind's published correspondence¹⁹ contains not a single letter to or from her. Under these circumstances, and since neither Grimm nor Kellner²⁰ knew of any such claim of Marianne as asserted by Creizenach, his story is untrustworthy, and is, at best, part of the gossip which was circulating in Frankfurt during the last years of Marianne's life.

Burdach therefore wisely ignored the Creizenach story, and based his contention that "Nimmer will ich dich verlieren" was Marianne's work solely on the passage of the *Noten und Abhandlungen* cited above.²¹ Burdach apparently considered these lines to be a hidden allusion to Marianne's authorship of the poem, and it is true that while Goethe, at Marianne's request, kept her cooperation on the Book Suleika a secret, he nevertheless made a number of such allusions to it.²² While without any doubt the similarity of thought expressed in the last two well-known lines of the poem²³ and in the passage of the *Noten und Abhandlungen* just mentioned is striking—as had already been recognized by v. Löper, Creizenach, Düntzer, and others—Burdach's contention was pure speculation.

Burdach obviously never saw the Bonn manuscript which survived the Second World War as almost the only remnant of the Boisserée papers. It was recently described by E. Grumach,²⁴ and inspected by the writer of these lines in the summer of 1954.²⁵ The manuscript

¹⁶ E. Kalkschmidt, *Moritz von Schwind* (1943), pp. 68, 72, 82.

¹⁷ Creizenach, *op. cit.*, p. 324.

¹⁸ H. Grimm in *Preussische Jahrbücher*, xxiv (1869), 13 ff.; reprinted in *Fünfzehn Essays* (2nd ed., 1874), p. 258.

¹⁹ Which was consulted but which does not have to be enumerated here.

²⁰ E. Kellner, *Goethe und das Urbild seiner Suleika* (1876).

²¹ See text to note 12, cf. Weimar ed. I, 6, 169. *Jub. Ausg.*, v, 393.

²² E.g., in "Behramgur" in the Book Suleika.

²³ "Denn das Leben ist die Liebe
Und des Lebens Leben Geist."

²⁴ *Goethe. N. F. des Jahrbuchs der Goethesellschaft*, xiv-xv, 334 ff.

²⁵ Goethe's own handwriting can be clearly recognized, as also stated in a letter of H. Wahl of the Goethe Nationalmuseum to the Bonn Library of March 10, 1933.

containing our poem consists of a piece of paper horizontally cut into two halves with an approximately inch-wide piece of the middle section missing.²⁸ These two halves contain on the front page a pencil draft of the first two stanzas of "Locken haltet mich gefangen,"²⁹ and are followed by the lines:

Trennen kann uns keine Tugend
[illegible] meiner Liebe Kraft
[illegible] meine Jugend
Mit [illegible] Leidenschaft³⁰

the first draft without doubt of the first half of "Nimmer will ich dich verlieren." These lines are followed by the third stanza of the "Locken"-poem, and on the back of the sheet by lines 5-8 of our poem.³¹

This pencil draft, with the exception of lines 5-8 just mentioned, was written over in ink, and numerous changes were made. Especially the whole first line reprinted above was superseded by "Nimmer will ich dich verlieren."³² Numbers in ink were inserted to indicate that the lines reprinted above³¹ were to follow after the fourth (and last) stanza of the "Locken"-poem, and to be followed by the lines on the back of the sheet—i. e., lines 5-8 of "Nimmer will ich dich verlieren." There is therefore no doubt that Suleika's response to Hatem's praise of creative rejuvenescence, contained in lines 1-4 of this poem, were conceived, drafted, and redrafted by Goethe and not by Marianne; and since the whole poem forms a harmonious entity, this is also true of lines 5-8, which are also contained on the manuscript in a pencil draft.³³

The various theories developed by Burdach³⁴ and others dealing

²⁸ A third piece of paper containing the first stanza of "Bedenklich" and the fourth stanza of the final draft of "Locken haltet mich gefangen" is of no immediate concern here.

²⁹ Differing in their initial form in numerous details from the final version.

³⁰ Since this draft was written over and corrected in ink, only a partial reconstruction is possible. Grumach's reconstruction, *loc. cit.*, p. 337, is reprinted here.

³¹ Lines 6-8 exist only in a pencil draft which is identical with the final version except that in the latter "Dichter" was substituted in line 6 for "Hatem." Line 5 is missing since it stood on the missing middle section of the paper. See text to note 26.

³² Grumach believes that lines 5-8 were not finally drafted since they were not written over in ink. Since, however, this version was practically identical with the final version, no corrections in ink were necessary.

³³ In their new form.

³⁴ With line 5 missing, see note 29.

³⁵ See note 3.

with the time of origin of our poem can also be rectified with the help of the Bonn manuscript. Since the first draft of "Bedenklich" originated in Mannheim on September 30, 1815,³⁴ which is also the date of the final version of the "Locken"-poem,³⁵ it must be assumed that the pencil drafts of all three poems, all of them sharing the same easy-going trochaic metre, were drafted on this day.³⁶ Since the fair copy of "Locken haltet mich gefangen" is dated "30. Sept.," it is probable that also the final drafts of the other two poems were completed on this day, although the possibility exists that they were finished a few days later.³⁷ Without any doubt, however, the final versions of "Locken haltet mich gefangen" and of "Nimmer will ich dich verlieren" were completed on the same occasion and on the same day, and only during the final process of redrafting did "Nimmer will ich dich verlieren," which formed originally the third and last stanzas of the "Locken"-poem,³⁸ emerge as an independent poem. With this the sixth "Wechselgesang" of the Book Suleika had found its final form.

Wilberforce University

KURT KEPPLER

³⁴ See Wahl, in "Goethe. N. F. des Jahrbuchs der Goethegesellschaft," I (1936), 141; Grumach, *loc. cit.*, p. 334.

³⁵ Weimar edition, I, 6, 421.

³⁶ "Bedenklich" cannot have been drafted before September 30 since it was the result of a dinner party in honor of Goethe on this day in the house of Stryck van Linschoten, the Dutch ambassador in Mannheim; see Wahl in his article mentioned in note 34.

³⁷ Grumach's contention that the final draft of "Locken haltet mich gefangen" was written on October 1 or 2, 1815 is not convincing. While it is true that the dates of the fair copies of Goethe's poems sometimes refer to the dates of the first draft and not to that of the final version, this is not the rule. The further reasoning of Grumach dealing with this problem does not have to be discussed here. Grumach, however, proved that the final versions of "Locken haltet mich gefangen" and of "Nimmer will ich dich verlieren" were completed after the completion of the final version of "Bedenklich."

³⁸ The fourth stanza of the final version of "Locken haltet mich gefangen" is contained on the sheet mentioned in note 26, and was written after the completion of the other four stanzas.

REVIEWS

John F. Madden, C.S.B., and Francis P. Magoun, Jr., *A Grouped Frequency Word-List of Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (Cambridge: Dept. of English, Harvard University, 1954. xi + 52 pp. \$2.00). THIS work is a pedagogical rather than a scholarly production; nevertheless, it should be of interest to scholars, particularly to those who are also teachers of Old English. The present list is based on Madden's unpublished Harvard doctoral thesis *Studies in Word-Frequencies in Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (1953), which centers on a count of the 168,500-plus words used in the 30,271 lines of Old English poetry. The organization of the list follows the principles and practices established by M. West and O. F. Bond in *A Grouped-Frequency French Word List* (See H. Bongers, *The History and Principles of Vocabulary Control* [Woerden, 1947], pp. 54,185-88). Under each head-word are included all related words, and the "credit number" is the sum of the frequencies of all words in the "credit unit." This accounts for the word "grouped" in the title. The spelling employed is that of normalized EWS.

The use of frequency counts as an aid in learning a language is widely accepted pedagogical methodology, and the present list should be of great value to every student of Old English. However, improvements could be made on it. At times the grouping is questionable. A word such as *wyrd* (grouped under *weorðan*) is frequent enough and semantically independent enough to rate a separate entry. On the other hand, a word such as *and-wlita*, with a single occurrence, might better be listed under *wlitan* with its semantic equivalent *wlite*. The use of italics to distinguish the term from its gloss (cf. "for for, on account of") would have been helpful. Finally, the work would undoubtedly have greater acceptance if the price were not so high.

The Johns Hopkins University

ALLAN H. ORRICK

Arthur K. Moore, *The Secular Lyric in Middle English* (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1951. x + 225 pp.). PROFESSOR Moore's book is, as its dust jacket points out, the first full-scale attempt to deal critically with Middle English secular lyric. As such, it

is inevitably an important book, for the subject is of first importance critically and historically and has heretofore been treated only scantily or obliquely. In fact, the same might be said of religious lyric. The whole question of English lyric before Wyatt is still an open and inviting question, even though a formidable one. If it were not for the forbidding dimensions of the "whole question," one might quarrel with Professor Moore over his somewhat confused separation of the religious and secular lyrics. Certainly his contention that "the typical questions raised by the religious lyric are more theological than literary and fall therefore on the fringes of criticism" (p. vii) cannot be accepted. But however unsound the reasons may be, Professor Moore addresses himself solely to the secular lyric, and, quite properly, he addresses himself to it as an educated reader of the twentieth century, bringing into play in his consideration of it whatever he may feel he now knows about the nature of poetry.

In the opening chapter, "Lyric Development," the author establishes three categories of lyric which, while they do not strictly limit the succeeding discussion, at least give it direction. His "embryo," "immature," and "perfected" lyric seem to equate roughly to direct declaration of emotion, declaration of a situation instinct with emotion (narrative elaboration is his term for this), and the re-embodiment of the emotion in some set of verbal forms. Over this primary aesthetic is worked out, in the subsequent chapter divisions, a second classification which is both substantive and chronological: II, The Harleian Love Lyrics; III, Songs of Satire and Protest; IV, Art Lyric: A Preliminary; V, The Chaucerian Lyric Mode; VI, William Dunbar. The substantive and chronological divisions are, obviously, conventional; Professor Moore's major accomplishment in the book must lie in his consideration of these kinds and phases of Middle English lyric in terms of the formal and functional distinctions made in the first chapter. And therein lies the first difficulty in the book. As long as the terms "embryo," "immature," and "perfected" carry purely formal and functional significance, they are a relatively clear and useful means of distinguishing one way of ordering poetic language from another. Even when they tend to acquire chronological significance (as they do for Professor Moore) they are in a general sense tenable, if less clear and useful. However, when they also become evaluative, they become dangerously deceptive because, being terms descriptive of the relative complexity of the relationship between theme and verbal structure, they can be used evaluatively only if we hold one

kind of lyric form to be "best." Professor Moore never openly declares any evaluative meaning in his three initial categories, but as he works further into his discussion, away from the initial definition of the terms, his value judgments tend rather constantly to assert the superiority of lyrics which would, structurally, fall into the "immature" class, to derogate lyrics structurally of the "perfected" class, and to offer in either case as argument for his judgments the structural characteristics of that class. (The "embryo" lyric is more or less out of the question by virtue of its non-appearance in the body of poetry under consideration.) It might be argued that such is merely the natural consequence of the fact that there was little or no good lyric of the "perfected" class produced in medieval England, and this may well be true, although it would not remove the objection that Professor Moore seems to offer the fundamental characteristics of the class of art lyric as reasons for the mediocrity of the Middle English examples of it.

The real difficulty here, I think, is not simply one of hazy critical language, but is rather a confusion in basic critical hypotheses about the relationships between subject, form, and effect in lyric poetry which can and should be questioned seriously. This weakness is evident at several points in the study, perhaps most clearly evident in a curious internal contradiction in the discussion of Dunbar. On page 200, Professor Moore, summing up the character of fifteenth-century lyric, asserts: "The learned poets of the fifteenth century were the eager victims of the heresy of form, which early killed off lyric and had ultimately to extinguish all poetry." On page 201, the following is spoken in praise of Dunbar's *To a Ladye*:

The tight organization of this amorous complaint is presumptive evidence that Dunbar recognized the need for careful articulation of the component parts of a lyric in order to produce a unified effect.

This seems to me to read that Dunbar escaped the killing blight of the fifteenth century's over-consciousness of form by writing lyric tighter in form. The resolution of the paradox is to be found in observing that what Professor Moore seems to mean consistently when he uses the term "form" is the purely verbal surface of the poem (if there is such a thing).¹ Since he is committed from early in the book to the

¹ See p. 135, for instance: "Such a literary judgment as this discloses how completely formal problems occupied the attention of poets in this century, and it suggests that the questions with which poetry ordinarily deals were

theory that lyric is the exclamatory utterance of "sincere" personal emotion rising directly out of "real" experience, he cannot allow the verbal surface to bear much formal elaboration.

In the section from which I have just quoted (as well as in others), it is apparent that his real quarrel is with aureate language, especially as it tends to pull poems away from the concrete presentation of situations productive of strong emotion. Here Professor Moore is certainly on surer ground, although his presentation falls well short of clarity. But even here the ambiguity of his concept of form clouds the issue. The organic theory of poetry, to which he appeals frequently, ought at least to have taught us that we cannot make determinations about the language of a poem without reference to some broader formal concept. "Aureate language" is not an absolute term. Yet (again in the chapter on Dunbar, pp. 200-1) Professor Moore quotes one stanza of the *Golden Targe* and damns it on the sole ground of its "pictorial extravagance," when in fact we must presuppose the incoherence and discursiveness of the whole poem before we can determine that the language is inappropriate.

Such stuff makes the ultimate concession to contemporary taste for decorative verse and marks the culmination of a sorry tendency begun before Chaucer and unfortunately encouraged by *Troilus and Criseyde*.

But it was not the ultimate concession. Spenser goes right on from where Lydgate and Dunbar left off, and the language of the stanza quoted would scarcely catch the eye of the critic if it were transplanted into the *Faerie Queene*. The difference between the two poems is not in the language *per se*; it is in Spenser's notion of the functional value of verbal elaboration. The fifteenth-century poets in the main lacked such a notion of formal integrity, largely because they had lost awareness of the heart of the old doctrine (represented, though incompletely, in the treatises of the rhetoricians) to which Chaucer and Dante had subscribed, and there were as yet no Sidneys to articulate directly out of Plato and Aristotle a new one.² The real sin of the fifteenth century is not a "heresy of form," but ignorance of it.

Behind his nearly absolute aversion to verbal elaboration, and ap-

answered to the satisfaction of most educated men by the constituted authority of state, Church, and society."

²Professor Moore's hostile treatment of the theory of poetry represented by the teachings of medieval rhetoric is oversimplified and inadequate, in the light of the weight he gives to it as a destructive agent in later medieval poetry.

parently to the "perfected" or art lyric typified by it, lies yet another premise, perhaps the basic premise of Professor Moore's discussion:

Lyric with a large dramatic core compels vigorous generalizing; but the poetry of personal, explicit emotion requires strenuous intellectual activity directed toward *finding segments of experience to fit abstract concepts*. That the human mind performs this last task with reluctance the medieval Church soon learned and wisely equipped sermons with *exempla* to tie down general statements of principle. *But the value of concrete referents in lyric poetry was never fully understood by English poets in the Middle Ages*. Pre-Chaucerian song is fairly concrete, as lately seen, but the poet's emotion is not often articulated satisfactorily with physical content. . . . *The fundamental problems of holding situation in suspense* (that is, preventing narrative development) *and amplifying personal emotions aroused by the static situation* have been solved to some extent in modern times by metaphor, but this convenient artifice is with Chaucer and his age merely a means of ornamentation (pp. 129-30; italics mine).

What we have here, I think, is a version of T. S. Eliot's theory of the objective correlative, interpreted at its narrowest logical extreme: the emotion which provides the proper core of lyric poetry must find embodiment not merely in a suitably evocative concrete referent, as for Mr. Eliot, but preferably, for Professor Moore, in a verbal facsimile of the specific situation productive of that emotion (see the third italicized statement in the passage just quoted). That this is in fact his view of lyric poetry—and especially love lyric—is evident in his criticism of particular poems. Almost without exception, the lyrics he praises are situational, first person, circumstantial accounts in which he can discern "sincerity," "reality," "tension" (by which he means a sense of dramatic conflict), or a "sense of life."³ As a consequence, we are too frequently given elaborations of the "slice of life" into which the particular poem supposedly opens, or the assertion that there is no such opening, rather than analytical consideration of the working structure of the poem: "The conviction is lacking that the author was himself the victim; instead the poem is probably an imaginative reconstruction of a commonplace drama" (p. 88); "Chaucer's love lyric, a genre by nature autobiographical, reveals virtually nothing of the life of the man" (p. 130); "The inevitable conclusion is that the poet's inability to define his love proves that there is no love,"⁴ per-

³ Except where the reality and sense of life become embarrassing, as in the seduction lyrics of the fifteenth century. In these cases Professor Moore's aesthetic judgments become abruptly moral.

⁴ What are the implications here for those of us who are in love but not poets at all?

haps not even a lady; and this suspicion attaches to most love lyric from Chaucer to Wyatt" (p. 132); "It is possible that Chaucer, as a middle-aged lover, is describing his own waning amateness as a good deal more fevered than was actually the case" (p. 133); "The conviction is hard to avoid that for once the monk Lydgate has presented a real situation. From the rubric, it appears that the barmaid waited on the trade in Canterbury" (p. 139); "The elegiac ballades on the death of Lady Beauty connote a strong affection and are reason enough for thinking the one attachment at least perfectly real" (p. 141). We are uncomfortably close to that implicit denial of the creative imagination which vitiates criticism like Manly's in *New Light on Chaucer*.

The practical consequence of these confusions and limitations in the critical premises from which Professor Moore proceeds is that we do not learn nearly as much as we might from him about how Middle English poetry was put together, except with respect to its major themes and such external aspects of form as rhyme and meter. Even though we may agree with the value judgments made in the book (and I, at least, often do not), the reasons offered for them too often turn out in the last analysis to be not really aesthetic reasons. Almost all of what Professor Moore considers bad he seems to consider therefore unworthy of understanding analysis. This has particularly unfortunate consequences with respect to the more conscious and artificial traditions in medieval poetry—the formal metaphor of courtly love, the academic poetic, the mannerism of the school of Arras, etc. The author's dogmatically unsympathetic treatment of these traditions blinds him alike to the fact that these are the traditions which provide ultimately the poetic vocabulary of Elizabethan poetry, to the basic aesthetic weakness of the general run of fifteenth-century poetry, and to some very real formal virtues in some of the poetry he considers. Yeats' beautifully artificial golden bird singing to the drowsy lords and ladies of Byzantium has, unfortunately, little place in the world of lyric poetry as Professor Moore sees it.

University of Cincinnati

ROBERT O. PAYNE

Dorothy Everett, *Some Reflections on Chaucer's "Art Poetical"* (Proceedings of the British Academy, XXXVI [1950]. 23 pp. Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture). IT is fitting that the memory of Sir Israel Gollancz, a keen observer of the art of medieval

poetry, should be honored by these discriminating observations about the artistry of Chaucer. Perhaps the primary accomplishment of Miss Everett's brief and fragmentary discussion is that she does manage to concern herself with the problem of conventional art in Chaucer's poetry without losing herself in the vague and arbitrary evaluations of Manly or the dessicant cataloguing of Naunin.

I take it to be Miss Everett's major purpose to redefine the question of the relationship of Chaucer's poetry to that body of medieval poetic theory codified in the treatises of the rhetoricians. It is certainly a question which needs redefining, especially in the light of fresh ideas about medieval poetic theory in studies like that of E. R. Curtius. There is a nice economy in Miss Everett's perception that what is most needed is to approach the question without pre-judgments about the relative values of one and another kind of poetry or critical theory. In this lecture we are asked to agree that the rhetorical treatises, right or wrong, contained real ideas about poetry, and that Chaucer and other medieval poets shared these ideas. Miss Everett's conclusions are implicit throughout the discussion: that both good and bad poetry proceeded from those medieval poetic ideals and practices; and that the influence of rhetorical theory upon Chaucer is not manifested only in bad poetry or in poetry which must be explained up to standard with apologetic references to "the taste of the times." It ought also to be pointed out that her premises, at least, require that we consider the rhetorical treatises as expressions of a *whole* theory of poetry and not as fragmentary prescripts. The latter has been generally assumed (and quite incorrectly, in this reviewer's opinion) by almost all the earlier investigators of rhetoric in Chaucer's poetry.

The necessary brevity of the public lecture prevents Miss Everett from developing, beyond illustrative examples, any of the points she is re-raising here. For example, she attempts no presentation or discussion of the rhetorical treatises as poetic theory, and this certainly must be done in any full-scale re-investigation of the important questions she poses. However, it is to be devoutly hoped that the critic who does make such an attempt will realize the nature of the problem as clearly as Miss Everett does.

University of Cincinnati

ROBERT O. PAYNE

Ge
(to
in
fift
defi
liter
exte
of a
T
Brit
The
bibli
1523
chief
on g
Th
Park
Trave
bring
his h
way)
own c
not in
chang
prepa
... Th
as dis
noted.
forced
the n
try to
Bec
docum
studen
Tula
Louis
Religi
Univ.
THE

George B. Parks, *The English Traveler to Italy, The Middle Ages (to 1525)* (Stanford, California: Stanford Univ. Press, 1954 [printed in Italy]. xx + 669 pp. \$10.00). THIS volume, the result of fifteen years' research, is the first in what will be a monumental and definitive treatment of the subject. The book deals chiefly with travel literature, but the context for these materials is provided by the extensive discussion of the history of travel and of specific travellers of all ranks and classes from England to Italy.

There are three large divisions: Part I, Roman and Anglo-Saxon Britain; Part II, The Earlier Middle Ages (1066-1300); Part III, The Ending Middle Ages (1300-1530). Included also are a selected bibliography; an appendix on Englishmen at Italian Universities to 1525; an index of names; and nineteen illustrations, which are chiefly from medieval documents. The book is very attractively printed on good paper with wide margins.

The "pattern of travel as a cultural phenomenon" which Professor Parks uses throughout can be indicated by the following quotations:

Travel prepares for a cultural transfer. The traveler both gives and receives, bringing some of his own cultural habits and adopting some of the habits of his hosts. Sometimes the resulting changes are large, and (if the travel is one-way), either the traveler is assimilated, as is most usual, or the traveler's own culture is in some part imposed upon the natives. . . . But a culture is not imposed at one stroke. More foreigners may be called in to continue the change. In turn, many natives are trained in the new habits, and are also prepared to replace their teachers as active promoters on their own account. . . . Thus begins a counter-current of travel, that outward bound from England as distinct from that inward-bound. . . . A further cultural change may be noted. As the new culture or cultural habit is imposed, is acquired, is reinforced, it may also be remade in its new home and be re-exported. That is, the natives pass beyond assimilation to modification, which they may then try to return to the original giver.

Because of its wonderful accumulation of detail and its thorough documentation, this book will prove a valuable storehouse for both student and scholar.

Tulane University

R. M. LUMIANSKY

Louis L. Martz, *The Poetry of Meditation: A Study of English Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1954. x + 375 pp. \$5.00. Yale Studies in English, 125). THE study of seventeenth-century poetry in these times is breeding

a type of scholar who, besides being a literary historian in the traditional sense, is a master of "close reading" criticism and an expert in theological and devotional backgrounds. Professor Martz satisfies the arduous demands of this combination. In both aspects of his subject his scholarship is broad, deep, accurate; he is genuinely interested in poetry as well as in information *about* it; he writes with unusual distinction of thought and phrase. The format of the book is worthy of its content; even in this desperately compressed review the Yale University Press deserves a word of praise for a beautiful job of production.

The idea that some kinship exists between the techniques of meditation and the structure and temper of certain "metaphysical" poems is not absolutely virginal, but it has not hitherto been made central and normative for the interpretation of seventeenth-century religious poetry in general. What today we admire in this poetry is the success with which, at its best, it integrates sense, emotion, and ratiocination in one creative act, thus compressing the wholeness of a complex man within the wholeness of a complex spiritual experience. Since he believes that this is also the aim of the principal methods of devotional meditation, Professor Martz advances the thesis "that English religious poetry of the seventeenth century represents the impact of the continental art of meditation upon English traditions" (p. 13). It would therefore be more enlightening to speak of "the poetry of meditation" rather than of "metaphysical poetry," of "the meditative tradition" rather than of "the Donne tradition." Donne himself then becomes the most distinguished exemplar of a trend fathered by Robert Southwell—recusant propagandist, author of treatises on meditation, and writer of poems which clearly though clumsily embody meditative practises. The other "metaphysical poets" resemble Donne chiefly because, with him, they depend upon the meditative tradition.

Confronted by an immensely difficult problem of organization, the author has divided his eight chapters into two parts. The first is devoted mainly to the technical prose literature of meditation; the second, to a detailed discussion of Southwell, Donne, and Herbert in the light of the governing thesis. But Part I emphasizes "those aspects of meditation which may be called potential poetry" (p. 21), and demonstration of those potentialities entails close examination of a considerable number of poems. Part II, conversely, aims to illustrate "the many ways in which meditation seems to have coalesced with

strictly poetical traditions of the Renaissance" (*ibid.*), and in order to explain the "many ways" Professor Martz is compelled to go more deeply into specific types, techniques, and topics of meditation than he did in Part I. It is not easy to say how the resultant overlapping and blur could have been avoided, but one feels that the author might profitably have thought a little harder about structure. As late as pp. 71 and 112, historical concepts of basic importance for the whole subject make their first appearance; they would have been more helpful to the reader had they been introduced earlier.

Regarded in its entirety, however, the book not only provides a valuable account of the art of meditation but convincingly demonstrates the considerable impact of that art upon the art of poetry. The thesis is established as regards important and characteristic poems of Southwell, Crashaw, Donne, Herbert, and Vaughan. Persuasive though less substantial evidence is drawn, more or less in passing, from Herrick, Wither, Marvell, Henry King, and (with reservations) Milton. The author's terminus, though he sometimes looks beyond it, is 1650; and he concerns himself chiefly with Catholic-minded poets, Romanist or Anglican, who were receptive to Counter-Reformation methods of devotion. But Part I ends with a chapter on "Problems of Puritan Meditation" in which we see Richard Baxter, at the close of the period, recommending these popish practises to Protestant worshippers and implicitly to Protestant poets.

Professor Martz tries very hard not to regard his thesis as all-sufficient for historical and critical understanding of the material: "The present study is focused on one aspect of the period; my aim is to convince the reader that this is one among the several necessary methods of approaching a full understanding of English literature in the seventeenth century" (p. 22). That important aim has unquestionably been achieved. At times, however, the reader may feel that for Professor Martz this method of approach is at the very least *primus inter pares*, and that he is tempted to stretch it a little further than it will actually go.

He is interested in something much broader, deeper, and more imponderable than the specific points of influence which he so firmly establishes. But if, beneath its methodological surface, meditation is essentially an effort to fuse the totality of one's being in a single act which is also the essence of the sort of poetry we particularly like today (pp. 67-70), the phrase "meditative poetry" becomes a tautology rather than a tool of historico-critical investigation. One of

Professor Martz's chief merits is his readiness to anticipate objections despite a natural tendency to underestimate their force. Thus in his final chapter, which includes interesting remarks on "meditative style" in Hopkins and several contemporary poets, he confronts the possibility "that meditative and poetic method are inevitably similar." His contention, he answers, is "not that meditative method created this tendency, but rather that meditative discipline cultivated this tendency of the mind, with the result that poetry written under such discipline shows a more explicit, more deliberate structure of this kind than can be found, for example, in Wordsworth" (p. 326). The validity of this statement is most convincing when he sticks most closely to poems illustrating specifically the method, discipline, and structure of actual meditation. But the Salesian mode, as he observes, is markedly less formal and systematic than the Ignatian; and even the latter is far less rigid for the adept than for the neophyte. As we move further and further away from the full rigor of the *Spiritual Exercises*, the term "meditative" increasingly implies a suggestive analogy rather than a statement of fact, and we find ourselves wondering whether the substitution of "meditative poetry" for "metaphysical poetry" would after all be an unalloyed blessing to seventeenth-century scholarship.

Nevertheless Professor Martz has proved to the hilt that meditative techniques exerted a much more important influence on the poetry of the period than has hitherto been recognized, and even when he presses his theme a little beyond his facts he remains extremely interesting and thought-provoking. He has written one of the indispensable books in this field; no serious student of the period will be properly equipped until he has chewed and digested it.

Hunter College

HOXIE N. FAIRCHILD

J. Max Patrick, ed., *SAMLA Studies in Milton: Essays on John Milton and His Works* (Gainesville: Univ. of Florida Press, 1953. xv + 197 pp. \$3.50). THE eight essays in this volume were collected as the result of a cooperative venture among Miltonists in the southeastern area. "Milton's Views on Universal and Civil Decay" by Joseph Allen Bryant, Jr., and "The Substance of Milton's Angels" by Robert H. West deal with problems of intellectual history, Mr. Bryant assuming the traditional background and examining the

evidence internally, and Mr. West assuming Milton's general position and reviewing other writings for more specific corroborations. Allan H. Gilbert's "Milton's Defense of Bawdry" and Robert H. Bowers' "The Accent on Youth in *Comus*" are lighter essays, Mr. Gilbert considering a neglected aspect of Milton's humanism, and Mr. Bowers suggesting that a knowledge of adolescence might be important for reading *Comus*. Alwin Thaler in his "Shakespeare and Milton Once More" supplements his own prior studies in Milton's echoings of Shakespeare with a new list of juxtaposed quotations, and Thomas B. Stroup in "Lycidas and the Marinell Story" argues cogently that Spenser's Marinell episode (particularly *FQ.* III, iv) may lie back of *Lycidas*.

Lalia Phipps Boone's "The Language of Book VI, *Paradise Lost*" and Ants Oras' "Milton's Blank Verse and the Chronology of His Major Poems" are substantially statistical articles, the avowed purposes of the first being to discover the "native content" of the language, to count possible archaisms, and to demonstrate "a practical methodology for linguistic analysis" (p. 116); the aim of the second being to determine the chronology of the major poems by a systematic analysis of rhythmical patterns.

The last two articles are interesting primarily for the authors' demonstrations of scientific method. This is particularly true of Mr. Oras' work, which was done with such energetic thoroughness that it should stand as a showpiece of scholarly virtuosity. His main conclusion is plain: "As for the text, the traditional chronology, in its salient features, is difficult to assail" (p. 195). The article is a reproach to the revolutionary chronologists, who have not avoided "subjective elements" in their work. Percentagewise, Mrs. Boone's efforts reveal less Latinity and fewer archaisms in Milton's poetical language than some influential critics have assumed, but even the figures do not discredit the most notorious disaffections to the style of the epic, and it is unlikely that the starch in the strictures of Johnson, Eliot, and Pound will be removed by these means.

Possibly the most important contribution, considered in all its aspects, is Mr. West's. As a specialist in Milton's relation to his pneumatological milieu, he considers here the angelologies of three schools of thought—Calvinist, Scholastic, and Platonic—for the purpose, on the one hand, of determining the nature and extent of Milton's supposed eclecticism, and, on the other, of suggesting a solution to the problem of a contradiction between established substan-

tiality of angels and such epithets for them as "incorporeal Spirits," "spiritual forms," purest Spirits," and "pure/ Intelligential substances." Assuming Milton's philosophic materialism, and rejecting claims for any trace of Scholastic doctrine, West finds good evidence among Platonist, occultist, and Calvinist writings to claim that Milton's angel epithets are not inconsistent with his general materialism. West asserts that Milton did not compose an angelology in *Paradise Lost*, but boldly adapted "his picture of angels to suit his conviction (to which *Christian Doctrine* shows his strong attachment) that matter is good and universal in creation" (p. 52). On the whole, West has written a careful and prudent study, and if the findings are inconclusive, yet the argument is strong that Milton was less eclectic than some have supposed and that "he made a rather painstaking synthesis of contemporary thought . . . with his own bold ideas" (p. 53). West's forays into demonology and his party-line categories should prove helpful to those who would take the measure of these "bold ideas."

Most of these articles are conservative in *tendenz* and modest in range. One may not entirely sympathize with the pervasive enthusiasm of Mr. Hanford's prefacing remarks. But his evaluations of individual articles as contributions to Milton scholarship are characteristically just. Altogether, this is a valuable miscellany.

The Johns Hopkins University

RICHARD WOOD

Albert S. Roe, *Blake's Illustrations to the Divine Comedy* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1953. xiii + 219 pp. \$20.00. Illustrated). THIS series of drawings, only seven of which reached the state of engravings, occupied Blake during the last three years of his life and are, with Botticelli's, the important illustrations to Dante's poem. They are now scattered from Birmingham to Melbourne (twenty-three came to rest in this country at the Fogg), and the edition of collotypes issued in 1922, from which the present plates were made, was limited to 250 copies. The desirability of publishing the series is clear, and while it is more than likely that students of the fine arts will regret they are not in color, to the student of literature it makes little difference, since Mr. Roe's text contains full notations of symbolic uses of color. Blake's illustrations are not so much for the *Divine Comedy* as against it: he used them to make a series of criti-

cisms, far subtler than any he made verbally, of Dante's system of thought. To grasp the import of the criticisms one must have a comprehensive knowledge of Blake's own system, which underlies them. With this in mind, Mr. Roe has placed ahead of the detailed exegeses of the individual plates a set of introductory chapters on Blake's symbolism, Blake and Dante, the unity of theme in the designs, and stylistic considerations. Clearly the important one for students of literature is the one on Blake's symbolism. This is an excellent synthetic view; to be sure, it could draw on prior labors, but the work of Damon and Keynes is now largely outdated, and in *Fearful Symmetry* Frye expressly states: "No effort has been made to deal at all adequately with Blake's . . . work as painter and engraver." In fact, Frye mentions the *Divine Comedy* illustrations only twice, and then cursorily. It is evident that Roe has not relied exclusively on existent secondary works, but has himself examined the original material. His discussion of Blake's symbolism in the introductory chapter does not differ markedly from the accepted view, though it is considerably more succinct than any prior treatment; his mastery of the material is not really seen until one reaches the explanations of the individual plates which form the true body of the book. Here he correlates the ideas embodied in each drawing with Blake's writings and with what has been recorded of his conversation; and on these topics his treatment can serve as a small index to Blake's ideas. Although Blake appears fully to have realized Dante's power as a poet, and indeed to have cherished the poetry of the *Divine Comedy*, he was clearly opposed to the system of thought it presents, and for him Dante's God was "the God of this world," that is, Satan. Dante believed in the Providential mission of the Roman Empire and conceived that the ascent to Heaven is impeded unless order and peace on earth are assured by the forces of government; Blake looked on government as the destroyer of human liberty, "the blind world-rulers of this life," whose arts are "Poverty & Cruelty." Dante believed that outside the Church there is no salvation, and he looked on the Church as a mercy extended by God to lead back to bliss His erring children; Blake believed that organized religion is the worst of earthly tyrannies, and in particular he looked upon Dante's Church as a "Religion that preaches Vengeance for Sin" and is therefore "the Religion of the Enemy & Avenger." These matters are well known to students of Blake; but their knowledge in general comes from what Blake said. What Mr. Roe has to offer in his elucidation of the drawings is the

demonstration of a subtler comment. Blake's statements of dissent from Dante were often harsh and crude; they affect one as limitations and not as vision; they constitute little more than a compendium of wrath. In the drawings the opacity gives way to vision, and as Blake broods over the design that shall relate his universe and Dante's the wrathful is elevated to the tragic.

The limitations of Mr. Roe's work are almost precisely those of Professor Frye's work on the prophetic books. Each man regards his task as exegesis and not criticism. From Roe's interpretations it would appear that Blake's intellectual structure is not realized dramatically in the drawings, but is a parallel to which the lines of explanation run at right angles. Frye's interpretations made it seem that the same was true of the poems. It would be valuable to have a treatment which started with the poem or the drawing as a work of art and demonstrated that the philosophic system is (or is not) incorporated intrinsically in the artistic entity. Otherwise the poems and drawings become mere exercises in cryptography. Again like Frye, Roe lacks an adequate sense of Blake's position in history. Frye was quite explicit: "He [Blake] is an interruption in cultural history, a separable phenomenon." Roe has no such overt credo, but his treatment of specific symbols proceeds on a similar assumption. As an example, let us take the figure of the imprisoned Ugolino in Plate 68. Mr. Roe says:

This subject no doubt appealed to Blake as an allegory of his concept of the Fallen World as a prison of the soul. A political tyrant, and hence a follower of Urizen in the Fallen World, Ugolino now suffers from the terrors of that rule of law which, in his error, he was instrumental in supporting.

This is a highly intelligent reading, if Blake's symbols are taken to form a system without relation to any other, if, that is, Blake is a separable phenomenon. But Blake's predecessors and contemporaries had widely used Ugolino as a symbol of liberty. Often it was political liberty, sometimes it was emotional liberty; and through Fuseli, Blake could have known of the use of the Ugolino theme to break the rules of classical drama. His warm defense of Fuseli's Ugolino with its implied condemnation of Reynold's treatment of the subject is well known. Rather than using Ugolino to symbolize tyranny, it is likely that Blake was using him as the symbol of imaginative liberty. This view makes a more sensible relation between the Dante illustration and the use of Ugolino some thirty years before in the Gates of Paradise drawing. The difference between the readings rests primarily

on whether Blake is to be read in the framework of his century. Roe avoids Frye's tendency to link it unduly with modern concepts, but both men deal with Blake's symbolic system as if it had sprung into being outside the course of intellectual history and had no relations with the temporal order of thought.

Since the approach is from the intellectual system to the art work rather than the other way, certain shades of difference which might have considerable critical importance are slighted. For example, in Plate 20 the angel is so different in spirit and conception from Dante's that it might well serve as the key to the difference between their arts. Though it fits the sexual interpretation of Roe, I do not find that he has noted the change from Dante. Again, in Plate 27, it seems clear that Capaneus is a portrait (could it be of Lord Melbourne?), and this is an element to be considered in a final assessment of the design. However, it is quite understandable that these considerations should be left aside by Mr. Roe because he is dealing with such a tangle of problems at the more literal level.

Mr. Roe has been criticized by a prior reviewer for not citing W. M. Rossetti's *Descriptive Catalogue*. It appears, quite properly, in the bibliography, p. 208, under the Gilchrist *Life*, and is cited in the text, e. g., p. 133, n. 7. On the other hand, Francis Yates, "Transformations of Dante's Ugolino," *Warburg & Courtauld Institute Journal*, xiv (1951), which presents the view of Plate 68 given above, is not cited. To notes 2 and 4 respectively of the discussion of Plates 87 and 88 should be added: Charles Singleton, "The Pattern at the Center," *Dante Studies* 1 (Harvard Univ. Press, 1954). Plate 70 is badly titled: the line *E quindi uscimmo a riveder le stelle* is so famous a description of the issuance that concludes the *Inferno* that it would be better to call this plate "Virgil girds Dante with a rush;" Roe correctly places it with the *Purgatorio* section.

The fact that a reviewer must have recourse to minutiae if he would find a flaw in Mr. Roe's work indicates how solid and significant his book is. Though it was originally a doctoral dissertation, it has retained neither the manner nor the distortion of substance common to that genre. It is indispensable to any serious study of this phase of Blake's activity; it is now, and doubtless will be for a long time, the definitive work on the subject.

Columbia University

EDWARD WILLIAMSON

Jay B. Hubbell, *The South in American Literature, 1607-1900* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1954. xix + 987 pp. \$10.00). SCHOLARS and students have waited a long time for this book, which was twenty years in the making. It is a much-needed book, for no history of Southern literature has appeared since Montrose J. Moses published his *Literature of the South* in 1910. Although there is no such thing as a "definitive" literary history, this volume comes as near it as any that is likely to be produced in its field for many years. Into it have gone the results of scores of special studies, some by the author himself during more than thirty years of research and teaching in the area of Southern literature. Of these he has made the fullest use, and besides, as he remarks in the foreword, he has read more of the literature itself, good and bad, than any subsequent scholar is likely to have the patience to do. This book is the culmination of a lifetime of fruitful study and research, and it will long remain a landmark for students of the literature and social history of the South.

Professor Hubbell's original plan was to end his history with the close of the Civil War, and the influence of this plan is evident in the proportions of the book as published. He later decided to include the more important writers of the "New South" period, 1865 to 1900, and also an epilogue on the twentieth century. I have no quarrel whatever with this arrangement, though it creates a quantitative imbalance in the treatment of the middle and last thirds of the nineteenth century. The first two sections of the book, covering the Colonial Period and the Revolution, are given 166 pages; the two middle sections, covering the years from 1789 to 1865, are given 525 pages; and the last section (not counting the epilogue), covering the years 1865 to 1900, is given 140 pages. The earlier periods are treated with sufficient fullness, for they do not yield much first-class literary ore. The last third of the nineteenth century, however, was rich in literary production. If it had been discussed in as much detail as was the preceding period, 1830 to 1865, another two or three hundred pages would have been required, and that would have meant two volumes instead of one. This disparity is to be regretted, and yet one can understand and sympathize with the author's reasons for allowing it to stand. Southern literature in the latter part of the nineteenth century has been more widely recognized by historians and critics of American literature than the corresponding literature of the first half, and the materials for its study are far more accessible. What we have is a thorough and comprehensive history of the South in Ameri-

can literature from 1789 to 1865 set between the early period, in which social history is more prominent than literature, and the postwar years, in which only the main lines of development are traced. This is a practical solution of problems of time and space that seems to this reviewer wholly justified.

In the organization of the several sections, the author's method is to give for each period a summary of the historical background, followed by chapters on such topics as education, books and reading, religion, magazines, and the theater. After this he includes essays on important Northern writers and their connections with the South, thus enlarging the scope of the book and relating the South to the total pattern of a national literature. He then discusses many individual Southern writers, some of whom have done good work that has not been sufficiently recognized, and provides biographical and bibliographical information together with some critical analysis and evaluation. A few readers may wish that Professor Hubbell had devoted more of his space to criticism, for his comments are always interesting, wise, and judicious; yet most will be glad that he did not sacrifice for more criticism, however sound, the interesting and valuable social history and the biographical sketches, which supply information otherwise difficult of access. He has laid the groundwork on which other critics can build for years to come.

Many long-disputed questions are here presented, as they have rarely been before, in true perspective. Professor Hubbell's marshalling of the facts of politics, religion, education, and literary activity shows the early development of culture in the South, the growing conservatism and sectional feeling in the first half of the nineteenth century, the effects of the lack of any liberalizing movement comparable to Transcendentalism in New England, and the origin—not from the influence of Scott but from local conditions—of the Cavalier legend. Relatively fewer young men went to Northern colleges, libraries increased in number and in size but continued to be characterized by a predominance of Greek and Roman classics and the neoclassical works of eighteenth-century England and France, and the attitude of defense against aggressive anti-slavery agitation from New England made even the most enlightened somewhat wary of books from that region. The result was an increasing provincialism and self-satisfaction. Southern readers found the older writers, particularly Irving and Cooper, more agreeable than the newer, more Germanized authors

of New England. Emerson and Hawthorne were little known, Lowell was of course unpopular, and even Longfellow was suspect.

Professor Hubbell shows that the Southern social order was at bottom no more aristocratic than that of Boston, New York, or Philadelphia, and that the overwhelming majority of Southern writers after the Revolution were of middle class origin. Yet Southern sensitiveness made even these middle class writers disinclined to represent plantation life in realistic colors lest it should be distorted for abolitionist propaganda. Besides, readers in the North as well as in the South enjoyed stories of glamorous plantation life, and it was natural that writers should cater to this taste. Thus began that idealization of a limited and outmoded way of life which stultified so much Southern fiction after the Civil War.

While the most distinctive feature of this book is its full report on the literary and cultural matrix in which the individual writer developed, there are excellent chapters on such little known but important Southern writers as George Tucker, Washington Allston, William J. Grayson, Albert Pike, and many others. The chapters on the major writers, Kennedy, Poe, Simms, and Lanier, though good, are perhaps less indispensable because these men are already well known. The volume is equipped with nearly 100 pages of excellent bibliography arranged under three classifications: General Studies, Important Topics, and Individual Writers.

Professor Hubbell has fully established his claim that there was better writing in the South than has generally been supposed, and that writers hitherto little known ought to become better known and be more fully studied. He has approached his work without prejudice and has dealt with his subject from a national rather than a strictly sectional point of view. One is not likely to forget that the author is a Southerner, but he will not fail to recognize also that this Southerner is first of all a scholar of wide learning and sympathies and that he is a meticulously careful historian. The old-fashioned virtues of scholarship—patience, accuracy, thoroughness, and impartiality—are here demonstrated so effectively that this book may well become a model for younger scholars in the practice of their craft.

University of North Carolina

FLOYD STOVALL

J. Russell Reaver, *Emerson as Mythmaker* (Gainesville: Univ. of Florida Press, 1954. ix + 106 pp. \$2.00). THE publishing idea represented by this book deserves to succeed: a short essay on a central topic, attractively printed, bound in paper, and priced within reach of the academic audience it is written for. The short literary study, however, must be distinguished in thought and style, since it cannot carry the cargo of research that may sometimes keep a larger hulk afloat. It is a matter of great regret to have to report that Mr. Reaver's book does not meet this test.

One particularly regrets the necessity of this verdict because Mr. Reaver's general idea is well conceived, his reading wide and conscientious, and his approach to his subject attractively generous. His aim is to set forth "the ways of creative activity in the intuitive mind of Emerson," as these emerge from a study of his poetry, and to assess the significance of Emerson's "imaginative vision" for us today by comparing it with "those recent theories of the nature of man and his creative imagination which have shaped the attitudes of modern readers toward the artist and the sources of his inspiration." The first two of his four chapters are largely a review of current theories of man's creative life. It is hard to discern much value in them after all for the interpretation of Emerson. If I follow Mr. Reaver, he promises either or both of two things: to use the findings of modern psychology to illuminate Emerson's creative practice; or to show how his view of the creative mind, stripped of its obsolete terminology, retains validity in the context of modern knowledge. I cannot see that he does the first except in the most general manner; and he is deflected from the second to argue that modern psychology does not necessarily invalidate Emerson's conception of an Over-Soul—an apologetic issue of distinctly secondary interest.

The situation is not much better with the last two chapters, an examination of Emerson's images and of the structural patterns of his poems. The first is very cursory and is contented largely to emphasize Emerson's "characteristic intellectuality." The last, Mr. Reaver's most original chapter, may well make a contribution to the analysis of Emerson's poetic structures, though his findings happen to strike me as vague and uncritical.

The problem he attacks is challenging and still awaits solution. Few good poets have perpetrated more bad lines than Emerson; yet his poetry can exert unparalleled power within a narrow range and over a short distance. Two facts are discernible about his successes.

First, they are not due to his imagery, as Mr. Reaver assumes, but are primarily a triumph of *tone*. The success of "Brahma," for example, is not a matter of "brilliant images," but of a compelling speaking voice. Emerson can impersonate God, at least this God, with conviction. "Terminus," "Days," "The Snow-Storm" are further examples.

Second, the strength of his best passages—and one must insist in the face of the "tearer-downers" that this strength is great—stems nearly always from an overriding idea, a meter-making argument that fully engages his austere imagination. Generally this is a vision of divine or divinely-inspired power or life, as in "Two Rivers," or parts of "The Problem," or the end of "Threnody." Such passages, as Hawthorne said of his *Twice-Told Tales*, must be read in the right light to be appreciated. Read "in the sunshine" they can seem plain, short-winded, awkward. From the right angle of vision, however, they become incandescent with the Idea and radiate a spiritual energy not quite like anything else in literature. Emerson rises to poetry by sheer force of character.

A gem with such lights in it, however flawed, is not to be thrown away. Mr. Reaver has rightly seen and felt this vitalizing power but has not been able to deal with it. It is creditable, however, to have tried and failed to bend the bow of Ulysses. Not everyone knows what is worthy to be attempted.

Swarthmore College

STEPHEN E. WHICHER

Aasta Stene, *Hiatus in English: Problems of Catenation and Juncture* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1954. 102 pp. 13.50 Danish crowns. *Anglistica*, 3). THIS study is concerned with what happens when two words come together, the first ending with a vowel and the second beginning thus. Ordinarily one of three things then occurs: one of the vowels is lost, i. e., elided or consonantized; both are pronounced but with an intervening pause, i. e. hiatus; or instead of hiatus some other separating, or linking, device is employed. These devices are various, but in English the principal ones are linking *r*, i. e. *r* is retained before a following vowel, e. g. *far away*; intrusive *r*, e. g. *idear of*; linking *n*, e. g. *an apple*; and vowel alternation, i. e. the vowel of *the* is [ɪ] before vowels and [ə] before consonants.

Miss Stene, who is Professor of English at Oslo, is interested in the English treatment of juxtaposed vowels partly because it is diff-

cult for her students to comprehend and to learn to imitate accurately. Her monograph however is not primarily a practical guide for foreign learners of English but a comprehensive survey seeking to clarify our present hiatus practices and to explain their development. The first part is descriptive, the second historical.

In the descriptive part British Received Standard is used as the base, though other varieties of English, including the main American regional types, receive some attention too. Hiatus in other languages, i. e. Swedish, Norwegian, German, and French, is described only in enough detail to convey some notion of how English is peculiar in this respect. In English vowel juxtaposition is uncommon, occurring only about 7% of the time, and when it does occur actual hiatus is rather consistently avoided. In General American of course, where linking *r* is not apparent, hiatus is more frequent.

The historical part traces the development of the various linking devices and of the gradual drift, from Old English to the present, toward less hiatus. As traced, it is a complicated picture, involving many interrelated phenomena. The whole is neatly and effectively summarized in chart form.

In neither part is the factual information new or exhaustive. What Miss Stene does is to combine what is already well known, to show how seemingly disparate features have, or may have, a bearing on the problem of hiatus, and in turn to suggest how the study of hiatus impinges on other and broader linguistic developments. Her conjectures, of which there are many, are interesting and provocative.

University of North Carolina

NORMAN E. ELIASON

Paul Imbs, *Le Subjonctif en français moderne* (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 1953. 70 pp. Initiation et Méthode, Fac. II). M. Imbs has undertaken the difficult task of presenting to educators a succinct treatise on the French subjunctive. This means he had to attempt a general introduction into and a popular exposition of a much debated subject which it is increasingly difficult to present without getting lost in controversial questions of theory. One also has to have a pedagogical flair in order to satisfy teachers, many of whom have probably strong views on the subject. Under the circumstances, it was certainly wise to concentrate on an orderly and rather conservative presentation of the facts and to

relegate the more theoretical discussion to the Introduction and the Conclusion. Needless to say that practice must conform to some theory, and a mildly Saussurean view inspires this essay of descriptive grammar. A more radical theoretical orientation (although desirable) may perhaps be out of place in a book of this nature. Historical explanations have been sidestepped by classifying remnants of the past under "syntaxe figée" much as De Boer has advocated. The "syntaxe libre" gives an account of the subjunctive as it functions mainly in contrast to the indicative. The type of French accounted for is the written language which has little varied in this respect since Pascal and makes it possible to quote both classical and modern examples side by side. References to the spoken language and to the *français avancé* are merely incidental.

It is regrettable that the author decided not to deal systematically with the subjunctive of the past. Wherever he could not avoid mentioning it, his remarks are merely dogmatic:

Le regret (tour négatif; le verbe est à l'imparfait du subjonctif; emploi à toutes les personnes):

Ah! Qu'elle ne fût jamais née! (Fr. Jammes) (p. 28).

One would have liked to hear from a distinguished French grammarian how far modern writers avoid forms in *-assions*, *-assiez*, etc.: if there exists a real *gêne*, what does one do to solve the difficulty?

The treatment of the "independent" subjunctive offers a novelty. According to M. Imbs, there is a correlation between this subjunctive and intonation, comparable to the correlation between a semantical element such as *je veux* or *afin que* and the "dependent" subjunctive. This idea seems well worth investigating. It seems certain, however, that a distinctive intonation is by no means general for all the cases quoted by the author in this connection.

Intonation may not be a specific feature, distinguishing sentences with an "independent" subjunctive from ordinary statements:

La volonté du ciel soit faite en toute chose (Molière) (p. 30).

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur, mes salutations distinguées.

Quiconque est loup agisse en loup (La Fontaine) (p. 30).

In other cases, spoken intonation in correlation with the subjunctive cannot be distinguished from that of an ordinary exclamation. The two following sentences may be pronounced with exactly the same speech melody:

Dieu soit loué! Pierre est sauvé!

Sometimes M. Imbs' interpretation is difficult to accept. He sees *un ordre négatif* in the following example:

Et toi aussi . . . je te chasse! Que je ne te voie plus . . . que je ne te revoie jamais!
(Mirabeau) (p. 27).

I should see in this a wish: "May I not. . ."

Most of the examples of section B—"La corrélation intonation subjonctif en liaison avec une autre proposition" (p. 33) seem also doubtful. M. Imbs himself speaks here cautiously of an "intonation plus ou moins expressive," but the truth is more often than not that this is no relevant factor:

S'il avait eu du style, il eût fait un chef-d'œuvre.

Why should the "Imitation hypocrite, ironique ou familière du souhait religieux," as in

Béni soyez-vous mon père, qui justifiez ainsi les gens
(Pascal) (p.30)

be a category apart? The fact that it is an "imitation hypocrite du souhait religieux" is grammatically irrelevant. Why should *si* in

Si c'était la marquise qui revenait à son tombeau, . . .
(Dorgelès) (p. 41)

express repetition: "chaque fois que"? And if it does, is it relevant?

Monsieur Imbs insists correctly on the fact that syntagmas are two-dimensional: they refer vertically to the thing-meant and horizontally to linguistic context-elements. In his useful references to modern theories on the subjunctive the author had not enough space at his disposal for an incisive criticism, although he marks his preferences and doubts.

This book will be welcomed by the schools; it might also prove stimulating as a basis for a University seminar.

University College of the West Indies

M. SANDMANN

Angel del Río and Amelia A. de Del Río, *Antología general de la literatura española: verso, prosa, teatro* (New York: Dryden Press; and Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1954. 2 vols.: xvi + 908, xv + 869 pp. \$10.00). AS matter seeks form, and imperfection perfection—the Marqués de Santillana tells us—so poetry seeks noble souls. Anthologies, conversely, mutilate form, cultivate imperfection, and drive

noble souls to despair. The reader can scarcely do more than ask himself whether this anthology has wrought more or less havoc than its predecessors. "En estos últimos años las antologías se multiplican vertiginosamente," writes Germán Bleiberg, the literary editor of the *Revista de Occidente*. This dizzy breeding may be accounted for by the success, both financial and artistic, of the anthologists of lyric poetry: Dámaso Alonso, Gerardo Diego, Federico de Onís. Collections of lyric poems, each one published intact, fulfill a need, while doing little harm. But is there any justification, even a pedagogical one, for anthologies embracing a whole national literature? Does anyone in fact read, and derive profit from, the isolated scenes of plays and the half-chapters of novels? This reviewer's incapacity for such fragmentary reading cannot be general, for anthologies of pruned and lopped works seem to be sound publishing ventures.

Presumably the best anthology of this type is the one that presents, in a manageable format and in a consistent arrangement, the most literary texts that fall within its frame of reference. On this basis the *Del Río* anthology excels all others. The arrangement of the pieces—by authors grouped in long historical periods—is as tidy as can be. The criterion adopted—"el de presentar un panorama trabado, coherente, orgánico de la evolución literaria, no un repertorio de unidades aisladas y en gran medida artificiales: géneros o escuelas"—while difficult, perhaps impossible, to apply, is sufficiently flexible to allow the compilers to do as they please: e. g., to put Juan del Encina in the medieval section and his close contemporary Gil Vicente in *Siglos XVI y XVII*. Few texts or authors having any kind of literary or historical distinction are ignored. Nevertheless, one may wonder what became of Boscán's *El cortesano*, Sebastián de Córdoba's religious versions of Garcilaso, the *Diario de los literatos*, and especially—considering one of the anthologists' interests—the diaries of Jovellanos. If Alfonso X's verse in *gallegoportugués* is admitted, why, one may ask, slam the door on the great thirteenth-century *cancioneiros*? If the range is *Spanish* literature, why exclude Catalan? If Julio Camba represents the humorists' syndicate, should not Wenceslao Fernández Flórez be an alternate? Could not Rubén Darío have been included on the pretext of his historical rôle? On the other hand, is *Zalacoín el aventurero* really worth another reprinting? And so on. But such questions, that challenge the interpretation of the criteria set out in the introduction, are mere caviling. The compilers have doubtless asked themselves these questions, and reached their decisions.

The remarkable thing about this work, after all, is what it contains, not what it omits.

It contains, to concentrate on one period, Giner de los Ríos, pleading for education rather than instruction; Emilio Castelar, urging the separation of Church and State; Joaquín Costa, saying "Resistamos la nueva política militar"; Unamuno, threatened posthumously with the Index, proclaiming his heresies; Ramiro de Maeztu, urging a non-institutionalized *Hispanidad*; Menéndez Pidal, calling for the "reintegration" of Right and Left, Catholic and dissenter. . . . And it presents José María Pemán, not as the uncrowned poet laureate of Fascism, but as the author of a delicate nature poem, based on an epigraph by the Communist Rafael Alberti. And Luis Rosales, who does not deny having some responsibility for the murder of Federico García Lorca, taking some words of the dead poet as his point of departure. The anthology, it is clear, consciously presents a vision of a united Spain, tolerant of deviations from political and religious orthodoxy. Its unexpressed criteria—since the volumes will circulate both in Spain and abroad—are more significant than those expounded by the compilers.

The Johns Hopkins University

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie, hgg. von der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Neue Folge, Band xvi-xix, Bibliographie 1936-39. 58-61 Jahrgang (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954. xxiii + 1052 pp.) THE huge volume under review is the first installment since World War II of the standard bibliography in the field of Germanic linguistics, including the older Germanic literatures. In 1939 the last volume appeared containing the bibliography of the year 1935. Now at long last there is hope that the gap of twenty years from 1935 to 1954 may gradually be filled.

Until now we have had to gather our bibliographical information (and for the years 1940-54 we will continue to do so for some time) from the Germanic section of the *American Bibliography* in PMLA compiled by indefatigable H. W. Nordmeyer, and also from the Old and Middle English parts of the English section of the same bibliography. For Old and Middle English we were, of course, also able to go to *The Year's Work in English Studies* (through 1952), whereas

the *Annual Bibliography for English Language and Literature* unfortunately also lags far behind (last volume covering 1942 appeared in 1952). Very helpful are the several bibliographical articles by Kemp Malone entitled "Some Linguistic Studies" and published in this journal. For Arthurian literature we have been able to rely on the annual bibliography prepared until last year by J. J. Parry which since 1940 has appeared in *MLQ*. It has been supplemented since 1949 by the *Bulletin Bibliographique de la Société Internationale Arthurienne*, covering the years from 1939 through 1953 for Germany, Austria, United States and Canada, Belgium, Spain and Portugal, France, Italy, Great Britain, Ireland, Turkey, Switzerland, The Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries. Germanic linguistics is also dealt with in a special and rather detailed section of *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch*, of which the last 8 volumes for 1936-46 have come out in rapid succession (1938-1951). For Scandinavian in particular, both the *Acta Philologica Scandinavica* and the *Arkiv f. nord. Filologi* fortunately continued their bibliographical surveys throughout the war, those in *APS* containing very full summaries and often detailed critiques of the more significant items.

For certain other fields we have been able to resort to recent special bibliographies, such as F. Mossé's excellent "Bibliographia Gotica" (through 1949) in *Mediaeval Studies*, XII (1950), 237-324, and Suppl., *ib.*, xv (1953), 169-183, or to recently published handbooks containing extensive bibliographical sections, such as A. Bach's *Geschichte d. dt. Sprache* (5th ed., 1953—a sixth edition is in preparation), for the history of the German language in all its phases. By the same author we have *Dt. Mundartforschung* (2nd ed., 1950), for German dialectology, and again by Bach, the four-volume work *Dt. Namenkunde* (1952-54) for German onomastics.

However, we have had to be our own bibliographers, in a large measure, on questions concerning OHG, MHG, and Early NHG language and literature, Low Franconian and Dutch, Frisian, Germanic prehistory and archeology, religion, mythology and heroic legends, metrics, and medieval Latin language and literature. Only for the most critical years of 1940-45 did the present reviewer try to furnish a stop-gap in the form of an interim compilation which, covering the entire field and following the classification of the *Jahresberichte*, appeared in *JEGP*, XLV (1946), 251-326.

This classification has fortunately, in the interest of continuity, been retained also by the compilers of the present volume. It has

been edited by the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin; its preface is signed by Otto Neuendorff, who has been in charge of the *Jahresberichte* since 1935 (Bibliography for the year 1932). For reasons not fully explained in the Preface, the persons responsible for the individual sections are not mentioned by name, so that our thanks for a tremendous and self-sacrificing job well done, as well as our criticisms and suggestions, must be addressed to a host of anonymous contributors.

It was undoubtedly a very wise decision to combine the four ante-bellum years from 1936 to 1939 in one volume, even though it resulted in a rather bulky tome, and, what is more regrettable, it ruled out nearly all summaries or critical comments. Only in the case of books and articles written in one of the lesser known languages—such as Hungarian, Finnish, Rumanian, Polish, as well as Russian—has a very brief statement in German frequently been supplied.

On the other hand, there are several minor improvements to be noted. Whereas in former years the so-called *Sachverzeichnis* used to average barely a dozen columns or so, intended as it was merely to supplement the Table of Contents, it has now been expanded into a *Personen- und Werkverzeichnis* of 75 columns indexing more than 3,000 items. Moreover, there is a very generous increase in the number of cross-references to provide adequately for those items which deserve mention in more than one category. Thus under *Namenforschung* (p. 219) we are referred to the OHG and MHG sections, or in the chapter on NHG lexicography which offers a long list of articles dealing with individual words, we are referred to IE. or Gmc. word studies whenever pertinent. *E. g.*, G. Nordmeyer's "Note on *Boden*," listed under *Indogerm. Wortkunde* (H, 583, p. 127), not only carries the comment that it deals with Porzig's article of 1933, but it is also listed under *Nhd. Wortkunde* (VIII E, p. 209). Such cross references will be especially appreciated in the case of the innumerable *Festschriften*, which are so often rather motley aggregates of material from the most diverse fields.

The number of periodicals checked for the 1936-39 bibliography differs little from that for the preceding volume—354 compared with a previous 343. Naturally, a dozen or two ceased publication before or during the time under consideration, while new ones have come to life, such as *Archiv f. vgl. Phonetik* (since 1937), *Blätter f. dt. Landesgeschichte* (1936), *Dt. Archiv f. Geschichte d. Mittelalters*

(1937), *German Life and Letters* (1936), *London Mediaeval Studies* (1937), *Neue Jahrbücher f. Antike u. dt. Bildung* (1938), *Zeitschrift f. württ. Landesgeschichte* (1937). Others have for the first time been included in the checklist—viz., *Archivum Romanicum*, *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology*, *Jahrbuch f. Prähistor. u. Ethnograph. Kunst*, *Leeds Studies in English*, *Medium Aevum*, *Mitteilungen d. österr. Instituts f. Geschichtsforschung*, *Studia Neophilologica*, *Theol. Literaturblatt*, etc. As far as I can see, in addition to most of the European, all of the leading American journals in the field have been covered for 1936-39. In view of this broad international coverage we may hope that once the *Jahresberichte* are brought up to date, the work by our German and European colleagues will no longer suffer from the pre-war and war-time isolation so conspicuous in many of their scholarly publications of recent years.

This cheerful note is dampened somewhat by the discovery of quite a number of omissions brought to light when the present volume is checked against some of the other bibliographies mentioned above. While they do not represent a very high percentage in a compilation totaling some 11,320 titles, they are nevertheless numerous and important enough to be pointed out in some detail. This is done here not so much in a critical sense as in the hope that the gaps may be filled in subsequent issues of the *Jahresberichte*, and that the compilers may avoid repeating such oversights in the future.

A check against the Germanic sections of the *American Bibliography* for 1936-39 shows these omissions (titles are abbreviated in the following): H. A. Basilius, "Alsfeld Passion Play" (*PMLA*, 1936, p. 1281), G. Nordmeyer, "The Diphthongal Light Series," M. Metlen, "Letter of St. Jerome," A. H. Krappe, "Waberlohe," C. O. Williams, *Thraldom in Ancient Iceland*, A. H. Krappe, "Anord. Entsprechung einer Bodenseesage," H. C. Meyer, "Authorship of OHG Tatian" (*ib.*, 1937, pp. 1306-10), H. G. Reinmuth, "Abstract Terms in Notker's *Boethius*" (*ib.*, 1938, p. 1298), W. T. Eickelmann, "Pronominal Adverbs in OHG," A. F. Buffington, "Pa. German," G. E. Giesecke, "Loan Translations in German," M. E. Valk, "Verbal Prefix *ge-*," S. A. Anderson, "Attitude of Historians toward Old Sagas," G. T. Flom, "Norse Mythology," K. Malone, "Swerting," E. Wahlgren, *The Maiden King in Iceland*, idem, "A Swed.-Lat. Parallel to *Joca Monachorum*," E. H. Mueller, "Namen im Nibelungenlied," W. L. Wall, "Studies in Wolddietrich D" (*ib.*, 1939, pp. 1296-1301).

More serious is the failure to use the "Bibliography of Arthurian Critical Literature" for 1936-39—probably because it did not appear until 1940 in Vol. I of *MLQ*. Only the instalment for 1930-35 of the same bibliography, which appeared in 1936, is listed as no. 434 on p. 553. Consequently the following two dozen items—all published 1936-39, many of them in Germany—have not been recorded (for the sake of brevity they are listed here only by numbers): 1777, 1791, 1799, 1802, 1810, 1868, 1871, 1881, 1914, 1923, 1948, 1980, 2005, 2008, 2032, 2033, 2045, 2107, 2146, 2159, 2164, 2181, 2183.

Still worse is the overlooking of the excellent "Renaissance Bibliography" appearing annually in *Studies in Philology*, whose German section has been in the experienced hands of Archer Taylor and John G. Kunstmann. A comparison with pp. 351-71 of *SP*, xxxvi (1939), containing the bibliography for 1938, nets as many as three dozen items which should by no means be missing in the *Jahresbericht*. No doubt a checking of the other three volumes of *SP* will yield a similar *Nachlese*. We hope that in future volumes the compilers will for completeness' sake make full use of the annual inventory in *SP*, which is not even referred to in the present volume.

Apart from these gaps, the compiling of the individual sections seems competent and accurate, on the whole free from misprints, and in the case of books and monographs admirable in its full listing of reviews.

The first section of the bibliography, headed *Einzelne Persönlichkeiten*, turns out to be an almost endless galaxy of brighter and dimmer stars that have shed their light on some field or obscure nook of Germanic philology. I have counted more than 250 names which are mentioned à propos of a *Festschrift*, a personal bibliography, a scholarly appraisal, or a necrologue (pp. 3-31)—a list in which most of the members of the guild will take more than a mere scholarly interest. Very welcome are also the many references to out-of-the-way and therefore little-known sources of information about the history of important seats of learning, especially of old libraries and their holdings in medieval manuscripts or early printed books (pp. 40-61), such as Altdorf, Augsburg, Braunschweig, Dortmund, Erfurt, Erlangen, Fulda, Göttingen, Graz, Leipzig, Oppeln, Riga, Schaffhausen, Strassburg, Vorau, Zürich, and others. Bibliographical references to catalogues of manuscript collections are given (pp. 71-3), material on paleography (pp. 61-71), on printing (pp. 73-86).

Under the caption *Phonetik* we now for the first time find a separate niche for what is called *Phonologie*—i. e., phonemics, with articles by Trubetzkoy, van Wijk, Lindroth, Faddegon, Bazell, Laziczius, Martinet, Twaddell, Vachek, Hjelmslev, Trnka, Brøndal, Benveniste, Hill, Lund, and others (pp. 106-8). Of the items which follow under the heading *Schallanalyse* (p. 108), none deals with the analysis of sound as practised by Sievers. Seven numbers, 427-33 (pp. 113-4), besides one referring to the first volume of W. Leopold's study, pertain to bi- and polylingualism. The research which continues unabated on the problems of the Germanic (and German) consonant shift is brought together on pp. 130 f. (nos. 616-627).

The interest in problems of contact between German and non-German languages, which ran notoriously high during the years covered, is vividly reflected in the record output of nearly 80 titles, more than half of which treat questions of Franco-German contiguity as raised by the challenging theses of Gamillscheg, von Wartburg, Frings, Steinbach, and Petri (nos. 750-794, pp. 141 ff.). The most recent summary by F. Petri has just been published as Vol. XII of the series *Libelli* (Darmstadt, 1954).

The section on Gothic (pp. 145-8) contains several items not listed in F. Mossé's admirable compilation, namely nos. 2, 4b, 11, 22, 23, 28, 36, 37, 38.

Particularly welcome is the bibliography on the evolution of Standard New High German (pp. 194 f.), as well as the detailed account of the various instalments, letter by letter, of *Deutsches Wörterbuch* published through 1939—a useful checklist for all subscribing libraries and individuals (pp. 195-7).

The section on German dialectology is one of the largest in the book (pp. 257-321), with over 460 items on High German and almost 400 on Low German. As one might expect, German dialects spoken beyond the confines of the former Reich receive a goodly share, with 23 titles on the Transylvanian area, 38 on Poland, Hungary, Rumania and other parts of the Balkans, 7 on the Yiddish dialect, and exactly one dozen on Pennsylvania-Dutch. To the last-mentioned should be added, for 1936-39, another dozen mentioned as nos. 4, 5, 12, 42, 46, 52, 57, 80, 94, 103, 123, 153 in this reviewer's bibliography, *JEGP*, XLII (1943), 31-9.

Chapter XI, *Niederländische Sprache* (pp. 321-71), which had to be omitted in the bibliographies for 1934 and 1935, has now been brought up to date. It is very reliable and complete, if I may judge

by numerous spot-checks made against the bibliography which forms part of the unpublished doctoral dissertation of my colleague, Dr. Richard C. Clark, entitled *Present State of Dutch Dialect Studies* (University of Pennsylvania, 1954).

The same cannot be said of the section on *Englische Sprache* (pp. 376-418). It is very good as long as it is based on or checked against the *Annual Bibliographies of English Language and Literature* for the years 1936 to 1938 which are listed as no. 1 on p. 376. It makes, however, no use whatever of the same excellent compilation for the year 1939, although this particular volume had appeared already in 1948. Hence, in compiling the subsequent numbers of the *Jahresberichte*, the staff should not only consult the additional volumes of the *Annual Bibliography* (which are available through Vol. XXIII for the year 1942) but also go back to Vol. XX for 1939. In spite of this, a very respectable list of items dealing with slang has been brought together (nos. 101-19, pp. 384-6) and also, especially welcome, a bibliography in alphabetical order of studies on individual words (pp. 388-91), such as Old English *dōn*, *zān*, *gefyæse*, *foþor*, *timbres*, *Scald*, *toscecgan*, *lōh-sceaft*, *mæst-lōan*, *lūcan*, *þeofentū*, *ēowend*, *ambeht*, *ymbeaht*, *embeht*, *gullisc*, *swicn*, *zlemm*, *zewesan*, *e3(e)sa*, *zanzan*, *dȳst*, *dyþ*, **drocen*, *byri3*, *haranhize*, *hi3re*, *weazan*, *ȳst*, *betweoh*, *tuwa*, *gehygd*, *hyht*, *hlyst*, *gepyld*, *genæsten*, *hæst*, *dæg*, *begæd*, *afed*, *blægettan*, *cild*, *drep*, *earwunga*, *eolhx*, *felduop*, *georman-lēaf* (not *-lēaf*!), *geormant leab*, *hrider*, *hriðdern*, *hriðdel*, *mamor*, *mancus*, *nefa*, *neorxnawang*, *priusa*, *secg(e)an*, *seo hiow*, *þyrs*, *undern*, *wuducocc*, *zewealc*; Middle English *lake*, *hāk*, *lede*, *myse*, *o bon*, *rochine*; and Modern English *king—queen*, *lord—lady*, *all and some*, *fly*, *bug*, *amice*, *anachronism*, *and how*, *bask*, *big*, *brack*, *bundling*, *cant*, *case*, *happy end*, *end—ending*, *feud*, *fond*, *gadgets*, *go*, *lad*, *lay—law*, *onlocky*, *phenagling*, *pocosin*, *practically*, *second*, *snob*, *ticktack*, *tidy*, *tinker*, *wage*.

On the other hand, there are many gaps in the bibliography of *American English* with its 13 titles (pp. 402 f.) referring to publications by Mencken, B. Bloch, W. Fischer, Kurath, Mathews, Penzl, Read, Rositzke, Simpson, and Whitehall. The *American Linguistics* section alone in the *American Bibliography* in *PMLA* enumerates some sixty titles for the years 1936-39.

In order not to overburden the volume with a mass of material, local or ephemeral in nature, the output in the fields of Germanic prehistory and archeology, which from 1936-39 flowed admittedly

"überreichlich," was sifted critically and, we trust, undauntedly by Professor Unverzagt, who according to the Preface (pp. iv f.) took upon himself this commendable and delicate task. What was deemed worthy of inclusion has been divided into a general part on the status of research, methodology, and the over-all picture in the various states and provinces of Germany (pp. 418-44); then follow sections on the Pre-Gmc. and Gmc. periods (pp. 444-73), and on contacts of Germanic people with Celts and Romans and Slavs (pp. 473-85). The final chapter of this part consists of special bibliographies on the prehistory and archeology of the individual Germanic tribes (pp. 485-522).

Chapter XV on *Religion und Heldensage* (pp. 522-54) offers a stately number of comprehensive treatments of Old Germanic mythology by von der Leyen, H. Schneider, Baetke, Güntert, Dumézil, Mensching and Grönbech (tr. from the Danish). Moreover, the heat of the historico-political controversy raging during the years under discussion with regard to the conflict of Old Germanic religion and Christian faith is eloquently attested by the veritable plethora of books, lectures, pamphlets and articles by Germanists, theologians, historiographers, and—political opportunists.

As already indicated, the short paragraph dealing with "Arthurian Matter" is incomplete. The section on the Grail which follows numbers a total of 6 items, including one in Italian, one in Hungarian, and one published in Helsingfors! Very good, on the other hand, is the compilation on Runology (pp. 555-66) with the contributions arranged according to inscriptions on the Continent in alphabetical order, from Arum in Friesland to Zirchow in Pomerania; then follow the Scandinavian inscriptions found in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, Greenland and—North America (p. 565).

The sections on the various Germanic literatures, all of which include the period from the beginnings to about 1624, will be welcomed by all workers in these fields. *Altnordisch*, which during the years covered by the present instalment attracted a great deal of attention, fills pp. 566-589, *Althochdeutsch* barely five pages from 600 to 604, with the emphasis clearly on the Glosses, the Lay of Hildebrand, and Otfried, whereas as many as fifty pages are taken up by *Mittelhochdeutsche Literatur* (pp. 604-55). Among the narrative poets, Wolfram receives by far the lion's share with 45 titles, the Nibelungenlied ranks second with 15, Hartmann third with 10, and Gottfried von Stras-

burg fourth with a total of 5. The chapter on Early New High German literature (pp. 658-76), in addition to the customary biographical listings, also features several compilations by subject matter—e.g., ascetic writings (nos. 40-48, p. 659), drama (nos. 58-61, p. 660), historiography (nos. 76-89, pp. 661 f.), medical practice (nos. 90-95, p. 662). Incidentally, this whole section bears the stamp of one man, equally great in pursuing his own research as in organizing it for others, Wolfgang Stammeler. Represented with 31 titles of his own, he is excelled in quantity by only one contemporary, E. Schröder, whose scholarly contributions during the four years from 1936 to 1939 number 88.

The bibliography of Old and Middle English literature (pp. 722-56) is introduced by several systematic sections on comprehensive histories of literature, individual genres, types and motives, foreign influences, historical and cultural background. Under separate bold-face headings are gathered contributions dealing with Aelfric, Alfred, Beowulf (33 items, of which 5 are by Klaeber, 3 by Kemp Malone), Widsith (14 items, 10 of which are by Kemp Malone). In Middle English Literature 127 titles are devoted to Chaucer (pp. 738-45), 16 to Langland (pp. 748 f.).

The section on Medieval Latin Language and Literature and on Humanism with a total of almost 1000 numbers (pp. 757-835) is next in length to those on prehistory and NHG language. As in the former volumes of the *Jahresberichte*, this chapter contains bibliographies on Medieval Latin arranged by countries and by genres (narrative, lyrics, drama, political literature). Another paragraph gathers research concerning the influence of antiquity on the Middle Ages in general, and, in particular, on scholasticism, holy orders, and monasteries. Then follow the literary key figures in alphabetical order from Abaelard to Albertus Magnus, Anselm of Canterbury, Archipoeta, Bede, Bernard of Clairvaux, Boethius, Eckhart, Galfredus-Geoffrey, Gregory the Great, Hildegard of Bingen, Hrotsvit, Hugo of St. Victor, Isidore, Nicolaus of Cues, Petrus Lombardus, Saxo Grammaticus, Thomas Aquinas, Vincentius Bellovacensis, and William of Occam.

The bibliography on Humanism, too, is arranged first according to countries—viz., Italy, Germany, The Netherlands, England (pp. 809-12)—then according to authors (pp. 812-35). Among them Dante has been favored with only nine items (pp. 813 ff.), Erasmus with

as many as 171 (pp. 815-25), Conrad Gesner with 6 (pp. 825 f.), Thomas Morus with 20 (pp. 829 f.) and Petrarca with 6 (p. 831).

The volume is concluded with a rather small number of contributions in the field of metrics, none of any consequence except J. Fourquet's *Éléments de métrique allemande* (1936). What surprises, on the other hand, is the relatively large number of theoretical musings by creative writers and poets, such as Friedrich Georg Jünger (no. 30), Börries Freiherr v. Münchhausen (no. 31), Rudolf Binding (no. 32), Bernt v. Heiseler (nos. 34, 37), and Wilhelm v. Scholz (no. 36).

As to errors and misprints, the volume has been edited and proof-read with remarkable care. Moreover, the few instances which I happened to spot are nearly all minor flaws which the user will easily correct: p. 109, no. 351: "morpheme" (delete accent); p. 109, no. 359: "S. 195-99" (not "197"); p. 126, no. 572: a "full" discussion (not "fall"); p. 132, no. 640: "ē₂" (macron missing); p. 215, no. 464: "historischen"; p. 524, no. 17, and p. 527, nos. 64 and 67: here articles are listed from "IPEK" (not "JPEK"), but no explanation is given under *Abkürzungen* (p. xvi) that "IPEK" stands for *Jahrbuch f. Prähistor. u. Ethnograph. Kunst*; p. 567, nos. 9 and 10: "Árbók, íslenzka"; p. 568, no. 18 (no. 19 is missing): Turville-Petre's review appeared in *SBVS* (*Saga Book of the Viking Society*), XII (1937), 45-46 (the error was copied from the bibliography in *APS*, XIII [1938-39], p. 356, no. 495); p. 569: "Ól(afur), Ísa..."; p. 578, no. 162: "Guðrúnarkviða"; p. 578, no. 164: "Árbók"; p. 579, no. 185: "mann-iðfnuthr" (wrongly separated); p. 587, no. 278, 16: "på Man" (i. e., "Isle of Man"); p. 696, cross-references are missing for Suso to XXI, 649-53, and XXVII, 539-41, and for Tauler to XXI, 654, and XXII, 160; p. 851 under Bazell: "ē" (macron missing); p. 908 under Hollander: "Head ransom"; p. 920 under Kerns: "ē₂" and "eu"; p. 975 under Roberts: "verb-adverb"; p. 1008 under Twaddell: "intervocalic"; p. 1048 under Seuse: add "24. 165"; p. 1049 under Tauler: add "22, 160. 24, 166 f."

University of Pennsylvania

OTTO SPRINGER

,
-
a
s
l.
g
w
-
I
ll
,
"
;
4
at
"
s.
:
g
i-
,
t:
;
s-
1,
"
0
;
ld

),

u-

ar-

on

gs

no.

ng

olz

of-

I

will

09,

11 "

g);

64

but

K "

nos.

g):

ring

bli-

ur),

64:

d);

oss-

-41,

" e "

920

b ";

add

ER

Notes

THE FINER TONE

KEATS' MAJOR POEMS

By EARL R. WASSERMAN

Mr. Wasserman's perceptive reading of the poems combines an intimate knowledge of Keats' works, including his letters, with the most rewarding and salutary approaches that have been developed in recent criticism. Texts of five of the poems—*Ode on a Grecian Urn*, *La Belle Dame Sans Merci*, *The Eve of St. Agnes*, *Lamia*, and *Ode to a Nightingale*—are included.

"The sensitive and perceptive studies that make up [this book] are almost a model of the way in which the explication-of-the-text method should be applied to one of the great Romantic Poets." —W. J. Bate.

1953

236 pp.

\$4.00



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND

❖ JAMES C. McLAREN ❖

THE THEATRE OF ANDRÉ GIDE

Evolution of a Moral Philosopher

This first complete study of Gide's theatre considers his plays and dialogues as psychological documents which reveal more accurately than any other genre the succeeding phases of his development as moral philosopher and esthetician.

The dramatic form is naturally suited to an externalization of Gide's moral conflict, and the protagonists of his theatre represent the participants in a constantly changing inner dialogue of moral extremes.

1953

127 pages

\$3.00



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND

Rouge!

by Henri Duvernois

Sparkling, adult reading for students of intermediate French. An ingenious and diverting play in which the author presents the political ferment of the middle thirties as it affects the lives of his principal characters. Exercises and vocabulary. *Edited by E. M. Bowman, Randolph-Macon Women's College*

Ready This Summer



D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Atlanta 3 Dallas 1

Sales Offices: New York 14 Chicago 16 San Francisco 8
Home Office: Boston 16

THE HARMONIOUS VISION

by DON CAMERON ALLEN

One of the central poetic topics that engaged the imagination of John Milton was that of the vision given to man when he had put his own inner music in harmony with that of God. In *THE HARMONIOUS VISION* this theme becomes an important means of explicating some of Milton's poetry and of understanding his artistic intent.

As Allen leads the reader through Milton's poetry, he shows the twin development of Milton as a poet, and of the idea of the "harmonious vision" in the poetry itself.

In the Fall, the harmonious vision is lost, but it can be won again. Towards its recapture, Milton, true son of Eve, expended the full powers of his poetic life.

The book comprises six essays, written in a scholarly yet engaging style. In this new reading of the great poet, Don Cameron Allen has produced a book which the publishers believe will be of utmost importance to Miltonists, and all serious students of poetry.

146 pages

Index

\$3.00



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMewood • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND